

JPRS 83957

21 July 1983

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 7, May 1983



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

—JPRS REPORTS—

Japan Report
Korean Affairs Report
Southeast Asia Report
Mongolia Report

Near East/South Asia Report
Sub-Saharan Africa Report
West Europe Report
West Europe Report: Science and Technology
Latin America Report

Political and Sociological Affairs
Problems of the Far East
Science and Technology Policy
Sociological Studies
Translations from KOMMUNIST
USA: Economics, Politics, Ideology
World Economy and International Relations
Agriculture
Construction and Related Industries
Consumer Goods and Domestic Trade
Economic Affairs
Energy
Human Resources
International Economic Relations
Transportation

Physics and Mathematics
Space
Space Biology and Aerospace Medicine
Military Affairs
Chemistry
Cybernetics, Computers and Automation Technology
Earth Sciences
Electronics and Electrical Engineering
Engineering and Equipment
Machine Tools and Metal-Working Equipment
Life Sciences: Biomedical and Behavioral Sciences
Life Sciences: Effects of Nonionizing Electromagnetic
Radiation
Materials Science and Metallurgy
Meteorology and Hydrology

EASTERN EUROPE

Political, Sociological and Military Affairs
Scientific Affairs

Economic and Industrial Affairs

CHINA

Political, Sociological and Military Affairs
Economic Affairs
Science and Technology

RED FLAG
Agriculture
Plant and Installation Data

WORLDWIDE

Telecommunications Policy, Research and
Development
Nuclear Development and Proliferation

Environmental Quality
Epidemiology

—FBIS DAILY REPORT—

China
Soviet Union
South Asia
Asia and Pacific

Eastern Europe
Western Europe
Latin America
Middle East and Africa

To order, see inside front cover

21 July 1983

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 7, May 1983

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU-Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

CONTENTS

Speech by Yu. V. Andropov.....	1
Yu. V. Andropov's Answers to DER SPIEGEL Magazine (FRG).....	6
Yu. V. Andropov's Answer to the Appeal of a Group of American Scientists and Public Personalities.....	17
Yu. V. Andropov's Answer to the Appeal of the Heads of States and Governments of Austria, Cyprus, San Marino, Finland, Sweden and Yugoslavia.....	19
Marx Is Always Contemporary (R. Kosalapov)	20
Party Decision and Its Efficacy (I. Bondarenko).....	48
Efficiency in Party Work (V. Dobrik).....	60
Growing Role of Labor Collectives (Yu. Balandin).....	71
CEMA: Economic Strategy for the Eighties (O. Bogomolov).....	82
Article in the Journal 'NOWE DROGI'	96
Invincible Force (Yu. Zhukov).....	101

Nonaligned Movement at an Important Stage (Yu. Alimov).....	113
Does This Represent a Development of the Marxist-Leninist Theory of Contradiction? (S. Dudel').....	126
Has the Category of Essentiality Been Elaborated in Marxism? (G. Sadovskiy).....	134
Managerial Responsibility for End Results (S. Protserov).....	137
Science and Technology--for the People (G. Volkov)	140
Creative Approach to Philosophical Problems in Medicine (G. Vekua).....	148
Soviet Diplomatic Documents (P. Sevost'yanov).....	152
Bookshelf.....	156
Obituary of Yuriy Mikhaylovich Lebedev.....	158

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 7
May 1983

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : May 1983

Signed to press : 3 May 1983

Copies : 854,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1983

SPEECH BY YU. V. ANDROPOV

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 3-6

[Speech delivered at the 18 April 1983 Conference of First Secretaries of Central Committees of Communist Parties of Union Republics and Party Kraykoms and Obkoms]

[Text] Comrade Yu. V. Andropov pointed out that the CPSU Central Committee is consistently working to increase party organizational and political activities in all sectors of economic and cultural construction and foreign policy.

The Politburo and Secretariat are focusing their attention on problems related to the implementation of the November 1982 Central Committee Plenum decisions. Improving the work style and intensifying control over the implementation of decisions and upgrading party, state and labor discipline were emphasized. This met with the approval of the party members and all working people and had a positive impact on production. Industry fulfilled its first quarterly marketing plan 102 percent. The volume of industrial output increased by 4.7 percent compared with the first quarter in 1982. The 1982 indicator was 2.1 percent. Labor productivity increased by 3.9 percent compared with 1.5 percent in the first quarter of 1982.

It is important to ensure the stability of this trend of improvement in basic economic indicators. This is the purpose of already passed and formulated measures aimed at improving planning, perfecting the economic mechanism and creating economic conditions which stimulate the interest of labor collectives in increasing production output and improving quality.

The Politburo believes that in order to achieve this, all economic sectors must work actively and persistently to reach their set objectives.

Agriculture is one of the important lines of party work. The means for its further development were formulated at the 26th Party Congress. The USSR Food Program was ratified at the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The decisions it made are extensive and important. They will not be implemented by themselves, however, but will require the high-level organization and mobilization of the working people.

The situation in agriculture remains difficult. Naturally, it is affected by the poor weather which has been literally plaguing us in recent years.

However, even under these circumstances some working people find the means to surmount difficulties and to increase farm output, while others try to use them as justifications for serious omissions in their work. The CPSU Central Committee believes that active efforts must be made to surmount difficulties in order to accelerate the pace of agricultural development and to resolve the food problem.

The report and the statements made at the conference covered a broad range of questions. Although they did not extend to all problems facing agriculture, their discussion is important, for it enables us to single out what is most important at the moment and how better to organize matters.

Comrade Yu. V. Andropov then dealt with some current and long-term problems.

In the first place, we must ensure agricultural stability and significantly upgrade its productivity. Each republic and oblast has its features which must be taken into consideration in our work. Science and practical experience have proved that we must convert to zonal farming systems if we are to obtain high yields. Such systems have been formulated for virtually all areas but their application has been slow. In a number of areas the recommendations of scientists and specialists on such matters have been gathering dust for years while farming follows its old ways. We must accelerate the application of scientific farming systems. This means that in the next 1 or 2 years we must complete the development of crop rotation and convert to the type of crop structure which will ensure the highest possible output per hectare of land and make extensive use of industrial technology in crop growing, and apply efficient soil cultivation methods. These measures, combined with reclamation, the extent of which will continue to be comprehensively increased, could secure high and stable grain, feed and other crop harvests.

Agriculture must be in step with scientific and technical progress. The kolkhozes and sovkhozes expect more help from the scientific institutions. Something else must be emphasized as well. We have many valuable scientific and technical achievements and the best farms and frontrakers have acquired good experience. However, they are being insufficiently applied and frequently only at isolated farm enterprises. All that is new and progressive must be used more boldly, energetically and broadly.

We must firmly improve the use of the material and technical base created in the countryside. Frequent references are made to the shortage of tractors, combines and other machinery. Naturally, the kolkhozes and sovkhozes have not been supplied as yet with everything they need. However, nor should we belittle accomplishments. Capital assets in agriculture have quadrupled since the March CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the power-labor ratio and deliveries of chemical fertilizers have more than tripled and the size of reclaimed land has increased by a factor of 1.7.

Recently the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers passed a decree which includes a major program for further supplying kolkhozes and sovkhozes with new highly productive equipment.

However, even the existing material and technical facilities are sufficient for achieving significantly better results in agriculture, compared with the present. Such opportunities, however, are not always efficiently used. Many kolkhozes and sovkhozes have not resolved the problem of mechanizer staffing. Part of the equipment, including expensive power-saturated tractors, remains unused. Equipment repair and storage facilities are being developed too slowly and large numbers of machines are being written off prematurely.

Naturally, the quality of agricultural machinery must be improved. However, we must first of all organize their use considerably better. So far, the decisions on developing storage, repair and technical service bases are being implemented unsatisfactorily. This situation must be corrected without delay.

In order to resolve the problem of the efficient utilization of the land and the production potential in the countryside, we must, first of all, secure kolkhozes and sovkhozes with permanent cadres. This is no simple task. We must build a considerably larger number of residential premises, schools, vocational-technical schools and other cultural and consumer projects. Huge capital investments have been allocated for such purposes and urban construction organizations have been allowed to use their capacities in rural areas. Now it becomes a question of the initiative of the local organizations and their ability to organize practical activities. Many party obkoms have energetically undertaken the solution of this problem. This was discussed in the addresses at the conference. The Politburo approves of such an approach to this important matter.

Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized that now, when agroindustrial associations are operating in the villages and are entrusted with resolving farm problems, the party committees must substantially upgrade the level of their organizational and political work among rural labor collectives. Here, as through the entire national economy, a more decisive struggle must be waged for strengthening the discipline. A concerned attitude toward the land must be enhanced among the rural working people. To this effect, the socialist competition must become more effective and make extensive use of efficient methods of work with the people and organization of the production process and labor incentives which have been practically tried in recent years and comprehensively develop and strengthen cost effectiveness.

Work with leading kolkhoz and sovkhoz cadres assumes particular importance under current conditions. The difficult tasks facing agriculture, the growing utilization of scientific and technical achievements and the conversion to progressive methods for the organization of labor and wages face leading cadres with high and largely new requirements. We must see to it that they broaden their outlook and specialized knowledge steadily. We must determine thoroughly and without delay the extent to which the current system for cadre training and retraining is consistent with current tasks and take measure to improve it.

Many oblasts are allowing high cadre turnover. This is explained in terms of shortcomings in their choice and upbringing. Patient work with cadres and helping and supporting them are frequently replaced with bureaucratic administration. This does not help matters.

As we know, the CPSU Central Committee and the government passed a special decree on upgrading the role and responsibility of rural leading cadres. Its implementation must be continually supervised. Work with cadres must remain firmly in party hands.

The agroindustrial associations -- the new management organs -- have been assigned a major role in the implementation of assignments based on the decisions of the May plenum and the Food Program. The party committees must see to it that the new rural organs gather strength rapidly. It is very important to help them from the very beginning in choosing a suitable direction in their activities, and undertaking efficiently to resolve the main problems of the development of agriculture and the agroindustrial complex.

In ensuring harmonious and coordinated activities, all organizations related to agriculture and the associations must support and encourage the initiatives and enterprise of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The USSR Council of Ministers Presidium Agroindustrial Complex commission and the Ministry of Agriculture must organize the systematic study, summation and dissemination of the practical experience of agroindustrial associations.

The tasks currently facing agriculture have immeasurably increased the requirements governing the activities not only of central organs but of republic, kray and oblast party organizations and call for enhancing their responsibilities for the implementation of the Food Program. This must be emphasized also for the reason that some workers try to shift a great deal of concerns to the state instead of working energetically, and promptly resolving problems as they arise and making use of internal reserves and possibilities. This applies above all to the rather large number of requests received from various areas for feed grain allocations from state resources. Meanwhile, many republics, krays and oblasts are failing to resolve properly the problem of increasing production of rough and fresh fodder. This is also confirmed by the numerous requests for the construction of more and more livestock complexes based on state fodder procurements.

Almost every year substantial amounts of crop seeds must be allocated out of state resources. This is totally inadmissible, for today the possibility of organizing their production exists everywhere.

Many oblasts, krays and republics do not make full use of local resources in order to improve population food supplies. In particular, this refers to the possibilities of the population's auxiliary plots. We cannot consider it justified for a number of families living in villages to have no privately raised cattle. The auxiliary farms of industrial enterprises could and should be of great help in supplying labor collectives with food. In many areas, however, proper attention toward this important matter is lacking.

This is the crucial year of the entire five-year plan. The main task in 1983 is to secure the planned grain, feed, industrial and other crop yields and to consolidate the positive shifts which have taken place in animal husbandry.

From the very beginning of this year the Politburo has steadily supervised, centrally and locally, all work related to securing the harvest. Now, when the spring field work is spreading to all republics, high-quality agrotechnical operations becomes the most important practical task. Particular concern must be shown for the efficient utilization of reclaimed and, above all, irrigated lands and the efficient and economical use of water resources, in order to raise good crops. All operations related to irrigated farming must be supervised and the necessary steps taken efficiently.

Speaking on behalf of the Politburo, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov expressed his confidence that ministries, departments and local party and state organs will draw the necessary conclusions and take the necessary steps to intensify organizational and political work and ensure the successful solution of the problems facing agriculture.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003
CSO: 1802/13

YU. V. ANDROPOV'S ANSWERS TO 'DER SPIEGEL' MAGAZINE (FRG)

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 7-16

[PRAVDA, 25 April 1983]

[Text] Question: Clearly, no progress has been noted in the Geneva talks on medium-range weapons in Europe. The American proposal, which includes the "zero option," and, of late, the "intermediary option," appear incompatible with the Soviet proposal of reducing the number of Soviet missiles to the level of Western European medium-range missiles. In your view, what is the essence of the difference and do you consider a compromise possible?

Answer: We understand the concern caused by the fact that the question of limiting medium-range nuclear arms in Europe, discussed in Geneva, is not being resolved. Frankly speaking, the talks have reached an impasse.

Why were they initiated? The Soviet side suggested the talks and opened them with the resolve to achieve a reduction in USSR and NATO medium-range nuclear weapons deployed in this area, and a radical reciprocal lowering of the level of nuclear confrontation. The U.S. purpose at the Geneva talks, as it became clear, was to do everything possible to add new powerful weapons to the already existing extensive NATO nuclear arsenal. The United States would like to reduce the number of Soviet missiles only.

You can see that two opposite lines confront each other in Geneva, I would say two essentially different approaches. We faced this American line even before Geneva. As we know, the United States derailed the SALT II treaty and withdrew from a number of talks which were gathering strength or nearing successful completion. Let me remind you that the United States interrupted and is still avoiding resuming talks on a total and universal ban on nuclear weapon tests, antisatellite systems, limiting deliveries and sales of conventional weapons, and restricting military activities in the Indian Ocean. Let me add to this that the United States has still not ratified treaties with the Soviet Union on limiting underground nuclear tests and nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. All of this speaks for itself. The current U.S. administration has also come to the Geneva talks quite unwillingly.

To us, reaching an agreement between the contracting parties means reaching an agreement such as to satisfy both sides. The American administration behaves as though no centuries-old history of international relations, or the practice

of agreements and treaties, has ever existed. The recent change by Washington of its clearly unacceptable proposal, given the misnomer of "zero option," which is clearly unacceptable to the USSR, does not change matters. The U.S. administration is holding on to its previous unilateral position, showing not even the least amount of willingness to take into consideration the legitimate interests of the other side and to reach an honest, mutually acceptable agreement. In all cases, in formulating its proposals, the United States' essential aim is to harm the security of the Soviet Union and to disrupt to its advantage the existing balance of forces.

This is the main reason for the failure of the Geneva talks. The Reagan administration comes up with either the "zero" or "intermediary-zero" option in answer to our clear and fair proposals. Both are unrealistic and hardly contribute to reaching a successful agreement. Why? Because they would like to disarm us while arming NATO even more. We shall not agree to this.

Recently, the United States and some other NATO countries have been speaking of the "intransigent" attitude of the Soviet side. Strictly speaking, what are the concessions we are supposed to make? It is demanded of us that we reach an agreement only on the subject of missiles--the installed Soviet medium-range missiles and the missiles which the Americans are planning to take to Europe. The Americans simply refuse to discuss other components of medium-range nuclear weapons. They simply say they are unwilling to discuss the matter.

It is asked of us that we pretend not to notice the more than 400 warheads on British and French sea- and land-based missiles targeted on the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The Americans, followed by the other NATO countries, describe the British and French missiles as "containment" forces. I am willing to accept this. But then the question arises: Why is it that while France and Britain are granted the right to containment, we are refused the right to have our own respective containment forces equaling the number of the French and the British?

Mention is made also of the fact that French and British nuclear arms should not be counted because of some kind of "independent status." But have these countries stopped being members of the North Atlantic alliance? Do they conceal the fact that their nuclear weapons are targeted on the Soviet Union? Is it not symptomatic that the French government not only did not withdraw from but, conversely, is zealously supporting plans for the deployment of American nuclear missiles in Western Europe? What kind of "independent status" is that! On the one hand, the familiar NATO decision is presented as a sort of mandate granted the United States by all the members of that alliance; on the other, when we start to count NATO weapons, it turns out that the British and French missiles should not be included, for, you see, they are "independent." There is no logic whatsoever in this.

Try to consider the situation from the viewpoint of the Soviet Union and its legitimate interests: on what grounds and by what right do they want to leave us unarmed in the face of these British and French nuclear missiles aimed at our country?

It is obvious that we cannot and never will agree to this. The Soviet Union has the same right to security as the peoples of America, Britain, France and other countries.

We are also called upon to ignore the fact that, should we accept their suggestion, the Americans would retain intact in the European zone their air force on airfields and aircraft carriers, i.e., advance theater nuclear weapons which could reach Soviet territory. This includes hundreds of missile carriers and thousands of nuclear warheads.

Violations of universally accepted norms for holding talks and the unwillingness to achieve mutually acceptable agreements are manifested also in the fact that the U.S. administration is trying to disarm us unilaterally not only in the West, in Europe, but in the East, in Asia as well. Washington would like to dictate to us its condition of not deploying our medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the Soviet Union. Naturally, this is entirely outside the framework of the Geneva talks. Meanwhile, the Americans remain silent on the fact that they have concentrated numerous nuclear missiles in Asia, the Pacific and Indian oceans and the Far East. Incidentally, both the American and British press have occasionally hinted at the U.S. intention of deploying its medium-range missiles in Alaska. This would not remain unnoticed by us. I am mentioning this now as proof of the conclusion that the American side is demanding of the Soviet Union something which it clearly does not intend to observe itself.

The question is, who has greater reasons to be concerned with his own security?

What makes the formulation of this question even fairer is the fact that, as we know, the Soviet Union has pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, whereas so far NATO's nuclear powers have been categorically refusing to assume a similar obligation.

Question: The West and the East reciprocally accuse each other of the aspiration to gain military superiority. The Americans are even claiming that the Soviet representatives at the Geneva talks are trying to perpetuate the superiority enjoyed by the USSR in medium-range missiles in Europe. What should be the nature of a rough parity?

Answer: We are familiar with these claims. The American military and political leaders are particularly zealous in this respect. Actually, some other Western politicians are not far behind. Such claims contain not a single ounce of truth. Let us look at the facts. Recently, in an effort to move the talks ahead, the Soviet Union submitted for consideration by the American side and the other NATO countries a large number of proposals the constructive nature of which is obvious.

Suffice it to recall our proposals at those same Geneva talks on limiting medium-range nuclear arms in Europe. Today in Europe both sides have roughly 1,000 medium-range nuclear missiles and several thousand tactical nuclear warheads. Were our farthest-reaching proposal which, incidentally, the West

prefers slyly to ignore, to be accepted, no nuclear weapons in general would remain in Europe--whether medium-range or tactical. Would Europe and European security gain or lose were this proposal to be implemented? The answer is clear and simple.

This applies to another one of our proposals. Were it to be implemented, a radical reduction would result: each side would lower to one-third the present number of its medium-range missiles. In other words, we would have gone two-thirds of the way toward freeing Europe entirely from this weapon.

Finally, were the West to accept the variant which we proposed last December, the USSR and NATO would have 162 missiles each, i.e., roughly the number of British and French missiles on NATO's side. Each side would also retain 138 medium-range aircraft. Let me emphasize that even these figures are not final. They could be reduced on a reciprocal basis, with NATO's agreement.

None of these Soviet suggestions has been retracted. They would ensure full equality and true balance of forces.

Where do we see here the aspiration of the USSR to gain military superiority?

The complexity and danger of the current situation are rooted in the fact that the arms race imposed by the West is outstripping the talks. In order to avoid this and to create favorable conditions for the talks, common sense indicates the need to freeze the nuclear arsenals of both sides. This would be the most sensible solution until others have been found. We have proposed that medium-range and strategic armaments be frozen. In our view, this would be merely a first step. The objection is why freeze when we should be discussing reductions? This sounds nice but the trouble is that while this is being proclaimed the volume of armaments is growing. The result is neither a freeze nor a reduction.

The contrast in comparing the approaches taken by the USSR and the United States to other problems of arms limitations and restrictions is equally striking.

I already mentioned the obligation we assumed not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Were the United States and the other NATO members who have nuclear weapons to proclaim the same, all over the globe the people would breathe a sigh of relief. Why not do so? Our initiative, however, has been met with a wall of silence.

Here is another example: What is the justification for the fact that to this day the West has not reacted to the honest proposal, dictated with the best of intentions, submitted by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, to conclude a treaty on the nonuse of military force and to maintain relations of peace between the Warsaw Pact and NATO? A sensible explanation for this would be hard to find.

Or else let us consider the way either side is behaving at the strategic armaments talks. Let us compare the two positions. We are proposing substantial reductions in the overall number of strategic missile carriers,

without any exception, by more than one-quarter. The number of nuclear warheads would be reduced as well to an equal number. What does the United States insist on? It is merely speaking about reductions while essentially it is promoting a significant and "radical" increase in its strategic armaments. It is planning additionally to deploy more than 12,000 long-range cruise missiles. Let me refer to the latest news out of Washington: Yet another plan has been put on the President's desk: the development of a significant number of additional intercontinental ballistic missiles of a new type in the immediate future.

This can be described only as an unrestrained arms race.

Nor is it a secret that the United States is stockpiling and planning to use a terrible mass destruction weapon--the chemical. This weapon is already being shipped to Europe, while the United States is intensively working on new and even more destructive types. We are calling for banning the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and, in general, for their destruction. One may think that could not even be questioned. However, some personalities in the United States and Western Europe are praising the "usefulness" of this weapon.

I must say a few words on arms reduction control. It is being said that, allegedly, the Soviet Union is opposed to controls, for which reasons reaching an agreement with it is difficult. To use the German saying, this is "old hat," a threadbare argument. Control is as important, if not more so, to us than to others. We approach the problem of control specifically rather than on the level of generalities. This approach of ours has been embodied in agreements on the limitation of strategic armaments. Our policy on control is far-reaching. It includes the organization of universal and total control in the case of universal and total disarmament. We oppose turning the problem of control into a stumbling block at the talks.

Such is the real picture. I have cited merely a few facts but the list could be extended. However, even this alone proves the positions held on disarmament problems by the Soviet Union and the United States.

You can now decide for yourself who is aspiring to military superiority and who is in favor of parity and reducing the level of military confrontation.

Question: U.S. President Reagan intends to increase arms expenditures to the huge sum of \$1.6 trillion for the period through 1987. He is planning the development of the MX intercontinental missile, the Pershing II missile, and the cruise missile, and even the deployment of an antimissile system in outer space, which should make the United States invulnerable. With what do you intend to counter this?

Answer: It has recently become fashionable in the Reagan administration to pretend to be insulted when accused of militaristic and aggressive aspirations. Politically naive people may possibly be impressed by this pose, which is clearly a calculated one. In such cases, however, it is best to look at the facts. And the facts prove that the United States has taken the

path of mounting an unprecedented arms race in all directions and raising international tension to its limit.

Specifically, I am referring to the plans announced in Washington of developing a broad-scale, highly effective missile defense. The adventurism and danger of this idea are that the emphasis here is on impunity, on the ability to be the first to strike with nuclear weapons in the assumption that a retaliation could be avoided. At this point, the way to the temptation to press the launching button is short. This is the main danger presented by the new American military concept. It could only bring the world closer to the precipice. The result is that there is talk of defense while, in fact, the entire process of limiting strategic armaments is being undermined.

This fact has been confirmed by prestigious world scientists. We are proposing to the U.S. government the following: Let Soviet and American scientists and specialists in this area get together and discuss the possible consequences of the creation of a large-scale system of antimissile defense. Let science have its weighty say in the matter.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the development of outer space weapons is a structural component of American preparations for war. The Americans would like to go into space with weapons and from there threaten mankind. This cannot be allowed. Outer space must remain peaceful. We have proposed the conclusion of an international treaty which would ban deploying any kind of weapon in space. We are convinced that this should be taken even further: an agreement should be reached on banning all use of force both in outer space and from outer space to the earth.

An arms race should not be initiated where it does not exist and should be stopped where it does. This is the essence of our position and our guideline in the talks.

The Soviet Union will continue systematically to search for and try to find a common language with the American side. Our previous proposals have not been retracted. If the American administration were to submit proposals on one problem or another, which would be aimed at resolving it in the spirit of equal security, we would mandatorily consider it in a positive spirit.

Question: Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl intends to visit Moscow soon. How do you assess the prospects for relations between the USSR and the FRG, and do you see possibilities of cooperating should the Kohl government pursue the so-called further NATO rearmament?

Answer: A peaceful and businesslike cooperation between the USSR and the Federal Republic is an essential factor of European stability and international life as a whole. I believe that it is in the interests of both the FRG and the Soviet Union. A proper foundation has been laid to this effect with the Moscow treaty and a number of other agreements which our countries concluded in the 1970s. This represents a jointly accumulated experience in practical cooperation in various areas.

The Soviet Union is awaiting Chancellor Kohl's visit, the essential agreement for which has been reached. We hope that in the course of his visit we shall be able to consolidate the positive features in relations between our countries and earmark prospects for the future.

However, in assessing the prospects of our relations, naturally we cannot ignore the plans for the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in the FRG.

Judge for yourself the harm which would be caused to such relations were FRG territory to become a bridgehead for a nuclear strike at the USSR and its allies. Were this to happen, it would have the most serious consequences for the FRG itself.

I repeat, however, that the Soviet Union is firmly opposed to such a turn of events. We propose a different solution to the present situation, such as to strengthen the security of both the FRG and the Soviet Union and to allow our two countries successfully to cooperate in the interest of strengthening European and universal peace.

R. Augstein: I am quite happy to have had the opportunity to meet and talk with the high leader of the Soviet Union. We had already submitted several questions the answer to which we received in writing. Let me say that before our meeting I was already familiar with the text of your answers. I do not know whether you will give it to me now formally or that I should consider it as already received.

Yu. V. Andropov: I am ready to present you with this text. I believe that this is the most sensible and convenient way. Does this suit you?

R. Augstein: Yes, naturally. Thank you. However, since no text can be exhaustive, I beg permission to ask you a few more questions.

Yu. V. Andropov: Please do.

R. Augstein: Claims are frequently heard in the West to the effect that for a while, when the United States was not arming itself at the present and the planned rate, the Soviet Union was actively increasing its armaments. As a result, according to such claims, during the 1970s Soviet armaments increased while those of the Americans were even reduced.

Yu. V. Andropov: Such claims are not new and they are being particularly actively spread by both the Americans and their NATO allies. I have not prepared myself especially to answer this question, but proving that the claims you cite do not correspond to reality is easy. To begin with, let me remind you of the fact that it was not the Soviet Union who invented and was the first to use nuclear weapons. For a rather long period of time we had no such weapons at all, while the Americans had them and tried to blackmail us and the entire world. We had to catch up with them. Several years later the Soviet Union as well developed the atom bomb. We were forced to do it. That is the situation.

R. Augstein: However, was it not true that in 1977 the Soviet leadership itself acknowledged the existence of rough parity in armaments between the two countries?

Yu. V. Andropov: Precisely. However, I have not completed my answer. If we follow the development of events step by step, here is what happened: The United States undertook intensively to improve its nuclear weapons. It converted from single to multiple warheads. We were forced to do the same. The Americans then developed individually targeted warheads. We were forced to answer with the same. The United States then began to install MIRVs aboard their submarines, something which we did not have. In this case again we had to respond.

A rough balance of forces exists and, as we believe to this day, so does approximate parity.

Therefore, what has happened is that at all times we have merely followed in American footsteps rather than vice versa. However, while catching up with the United States, we have steadily suggested putting an end to this race, freezing the level of armaments on both sides and undertaking their reduction. Unfortunately, the American side did not agree.

As far as the present situation is concerned, naturally, it could be assessed differently, by way of different methods and approaches. For example, the United States believed that its nuclear weapons would be less vulnerable if placed aboard submarines, which is something it did. This is understandable, for the United States is a naval power. We are a continental power and most of our nuclear weapons were deployed on land. Now, however, the Americans propose that we reduce nuclear weapons deployed on land but ignore sea-based weapons. Naturally, we find such an approach unsuitable. In turn, we have taken into consideration all types of nuclear weapons available to both sides and have suggested their equal reduction on both sides until, in the final account, they have been totally eliminated.

As to details in the ratio of forces between the sides, our defense minister D. F. Ustinov recently discussed the topic publicly. He gave detailed data and figures. You would have no trouble getting them and would realize the fairness of what I have told you now.

R. Augstein: Many people in Western Europe feel that the Soviet SS-20 missiles, which are a new and very effective weapon, are particularly threatening to them.

Yu. V. Andropov: Strictly speaking, this topic is covered in my answers to your questions. Let me add the following, however: I realize that the peoples of Europe are concerned and even worried. We are in favor of removing the cause of such worries. We have proposed various alternatives: to remove all nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical, from Europe. The United States has not even bothered to answer this proposal. It stubbornly continues to promote its so-called "zero option," which is not even worthy of consideration. We have frequently exposed its true nature.

Therefore, we do not disagree on the fact that there is concern about the situation. Yet the United States would like to deploy its nuclear missiles on Western European territory, making you, the West Germans, the Belgians and the Dutch, its hostages. We are against this. We have proposed a variety of solutions which would make it possible either to eliminate the reciprocal threat entirely or to reduce the current tension significantly.

R. Augstein: The Soviet Union has said that if the Geneva talks would yield no positive results and American missiles are nevertheless deployed in Europe, the USSR would deploy its own missiles at approximately the same distance from U.S. territory. I would like to ask you, Mr General Secretary, do you truly intend to do so and, if such is the case, where in the world could you deploy your missiles?

Yu. V. Andropov: I could not tell you this even confidentially for understandable reasons. But if we speak of the essence of the matter, let me confirm this: we will find a way to answer the American actions both directly in terms of U.S. territory and Europe. Talks on nuclear weapons are not a poker game in which one could bluff. Such talks affect literally problems of the life and death of nations, of the Soviet Union, the United States, the Warsaw Pact and NATO. We cannot adopt a careless attitude toward the possible deployment not far from our borders of more than 500 nuclear missiles, in addition to the French and British ones already aimed at us. Our response would be fully justified from any viewpoint, including the loftiest moral standards.

R. Augstein: You mentioned here the French missiles, which reminds me of another question. The Soviet Union used to have very good relations with France. Yet, it is precisely a socialist government, with communists participating in it, that asked some 50 Soviet diplomats and other officials to leave France. How do you assess this?

Yu. V. Andropov: What can I tell you? Above all, I would not like the French socialists, and even less so the French communists, to be blamed for this grossly provocative step taken against the Soviet people. We are well aware of the fact that this action is backed by forces which do not want good relations to exist between France and the Soviet Union. Possibly, such forces may be found not only in France but also abroad. This act is hardly consistent with French national interests. It is arbitrary. It has no legal grounds whatsoever. Any assertion to the effect that the Soviet people engaged in impermissible activities is a fabrication.

Let me point out this as well: The Soviet people who were asked to leave France include some who had not worked in France for 6 months already and were in the Soviet Union. Others had not been in France for more than 2 weeks. Is this not absurd?

The only thing we are being told is that Soviet officials gathered information. To the best of my understanding, however, the gathering of information in the host country and passing such information on to one's own government is part of the functions of the diplomatic and other services

of any country or embassy. Is this a forbidden activity? It is legalized in international diplomatic conventions.

This action taken by the French authorities can be qualified only as a step deliberately aimed at spoiling Soviet-French relations.

Some French press organs claim that the lack of retaliation on our part involving French personnel in Moscow was allegedly an indirect admission on the part of the Soviet Union of its "guilt." This is nonsense. Anyone who interprets our actions in this manner is displaying his lack of understanding of Soviet foreign policy. Nothing could be easier than a retaliatory action involving French people working in the USSR. Our restraint is governed by the broad interests of Soviet-French relations which are important to us and which have developed over a long period of time and the interest of preserving detente in Europe.

This does not mean, however, that we would tolerate any arbitrary behavior whatsoever toward Soviet diplomats and other personnel in our foreign missions.

R. Augstein: Yes, one could say that in this case you turned the other cheek, as the Bible advises.

Yu. V. Andropov: Not quite. We have hardly anything in common with biblical characters. We were guided by sober political considerations and the desire not to allow a worsening in Soviet-French relations and we took a broader look at things rather than concentrate on this narrow local conflict.

R. Augstein: Inasmuch as we have already touched on biblical subjects, let me say the following: Addressing a religious audience, President Reagan proclaimed the Soviet Union a "center of evil." You provided your own evaluation in answer to this statement. I would like to ask, however, given such an atmosphere, are any sensible and successful talks possible at all?

Yu. V. Andropov: We are sufficiently realistic to pay no attention to rhetoric. Had Reagan, other than his accusations, accepted even a single one of our specific proposals on matters of reducing weapons or had himself submitted even a single sensible and suitable proposal we would forgive his unfounded, to put it mildly, declaration. The French are obviously right when they say that one can only talk in the language one knows.

R. Augstein: It is rarely the case for the entire evil or fault to be concentrated on one side only, even if this happens to be the East toward the West and the West toward the East. In this connection, I must ask the following: Does the Soviet Union realize the extent to which the question of Afghanistan is spoiling the international atmosphere and are there plans for correcting this situation?

Yu. V. Andropov: In answer to the first part of your question I will say the following: Naturally, it is. Our plans for a political settlement of the Afghan problem are no secret. We have announced them publicly and frequently. This was mentioned by Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev himself. We believe that

the moment outside intervention in Afghan affairs comes to an end and its nonresumption is guaranteed, our troops will be withdrawn. Our forces are in that country on the request of the legitimate Afghan government--the government which was then in power--and they remain there on the request of the legitimate government headed by B. Karmal. We seek nothing for ourselves in that country. We have answered a request for assistance on the part of a friendly neighboring country. Naturally, however, we are far from being indifferent to what is taking place directly on our southern border. Washington even grants itself the right to determine what government there should be in Nicaragua, for, allegedly this affects vital U.S. interests. Nicaragua, however, lies more than 1,000 kilometers away from the United States, while we share a common border with Afghanistan. Therefore, by helping our friends, we are also thinking of our own security interests.

Political talks are under way to settle problems related to Afghanistan. It is true that they are difficult, for the Pakistanis, one could say, are being supported by their overseas friends. Nevertheless, we believe that these talks, which are taking place with the help of a representative of the UN secretary general, offers some prospects.

R. Augstein: Once again I would like to return to the question of medium-range missiles. Assuming, nevertheless, that the Americans deploy them in the FRG, will you continue your talks with the United States on nuclear weapons in Europe?

Yu. V. Andropov: The Soviet side has frequently emphasized that such a course of events would mean a drastic change in the circumstances for the worse not only in Europe but globally. We would consequently have to make necessary decisions.

R. Augstein: There is one more question which concerns a large number of people in the FRG. We know that the foreign indebtedness of some socialist countries has reached today an extremely dangerous level. What possible solution could be found to avoid a worsening of the crisis, for all of us in Europe are interdependent.

Yu. V. Andropov: Since this is a question of sovereign countries, I can only say that the search for a solution to such problems is the sovereign matter of the individual country. As to what the FRG could do, the only advice I could give is the following: trade, developing economic relations instead of engaging in "sanctions."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/13

YU. V. ANDROPOV'S ANSWER TO THE APPEAL OF A GROUP OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS AND
PUBLIC PERSONALITIES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 16-17

[PRAVDA, 29 April 1983]

[Text] Gentlemen:

Your appeal on banning space weapons is imbued with great concern for the peaceful future of outer space. I share this concern fully. Preventing the militarization of outer space is one of the primary problems facing mankind, and its solution largely depends on what we do here, on earth.

As scientists and specialists you are well aware of the exceptionally dangerous consequences of saturating outer space with deadly weapons. State officials, politicians and scientists must indeed do everything possible as of now so that the accomplishments of the human mind and the accelerated progress of science and technology are not used to the detriment of the people.

Let me emphasize that it is precisely the Soviet Union -- the country which opened the way to outer space 25 years ago -- that is the initiator of and participant in all existing international agreements aimed at the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes, for the good of mankind.

In order radically to resolve this problem, the Soviet Union, as I assume you know, proposed the conclusion of a treaty which would ban the placing in outer space weapons of any kind. A draft of such a treaty was submitted by us to the UN as early as August 1981. The implementation of this Soviet proposal which was overwhelmingly approved by the members of the United Nations would mean that the efforts to turn outer space into a source of mortal danger to the people would be reliably blocked.

Unfortunately, work on such a draft treaty has essentially still not been undertaken by the Committee on Disarmament because of the stand adopted by the United States and several other NATO members. Furthermore, recent events indicate that an increasing role is being assigned to the use of military space technology in U.S. strategic considerations, including those proclaimed on the highest official level.

The decisive moment is indeed approaching: The interested countries will either take their place around the conference table without delay and undertake to draft a treaty which would forbid placing any kind of weapons in outer space or else the arms race will shift there.

I can assure you that the Soviet Union will continue to dedicate maximal efforts to prevent the sinister plans for shifting the arms race to outer space from becoming reality.

I would like to hope that scientists and public personalities the world over will also make their contribution to allowing outer space to remain forever free from all weapons, and not to become an area of military conflicts or a threat to those who live on earth.

I wish you success in your efforts in defense of a peaceful outer space, efforts which meet with the full support of the Soviet Union.

Respectfully yours,

Yu. Andropov

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/13

YU. V. ANDROPOV ANSWER TO THE APPEAL OF THE HEADS OF STATES AND GOVERNMENTS OF AUSTRIA, CYPRUS, SAN MARINO, FINLAND, SWEDEN AND YUGOSLAVIA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 p 18

[PRAVDA, 1 May 1983]

[Text] As reported in the Soviet press, the heads of states and governments of Austria, Cyprus, San Marino, Finland, Sweden and Yugoslavia sent an appeal to Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and to the heads of all other countries attending the Madrid meeting.

Yu. V. Andropov's answer to the heads of the six neutral and nonaligned states was that the Soviet leadership considered their joint appeal attentively.

We share the thoughts and considerations expressed in the appeal, the answer states, and understand the concern expressed on the subject of the state of affairs at the Madrid meeting of representatives of countries members of the European Security and Cooperation Conference. We properly acknowledge the aspiration of the neutral and nonaligned countries to contribute in all possible ways to the soonest possible successful conclusion of the meeting.

As to the Soviet Union, the answer goes on to say, from the very start of the Madrid meeting it has made persistent efforts to achieve substantial positive agreements which would constitute a noticeable step in strengthening security and developing cooperation in Europe on the foundations defined in the Helsinki Final Act. As we see it, our views coincide on this main point.

The updated draft document on the results of the meeting, which was submitted by the neutral and nonaligned countries on 15 March 1983, is considered by the Soviet Union as a basis for reaching complete agreement on this document soon.

Now, Yu. V. Andropov emphasized, the political will of the countries is of decisive importance. Such will exists in the Soviet Union. Our country is ready to cooperate in a businesslike and constructive spirit with all participating countries in the interest of making the Madrid meeting successful.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

**5003
CSO: 1802/13**

MARX IS ALWAYS CONTEMPORARY

PM002210 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 19-42

[Article by R. Kosalapov under the rubric "Father of Scientific Communism"]

[Text] "Marx' work, which in itself represents a gigantic whole as a scientific achievement, surpasses the direct demands of the proletariat's class struggle, for whose sake 't was actually created. In both his painstaking, complete analysis of the capitalist economy and his historical method of analysis, with its immeasurably broad sphere of application, Marx provided far more than was necessary for the practical needs of the class struggle."
--Rosa Luxemburg

Marx is inexhaustibly profound and invariably topical.

Marx' ideological legacy does not age.

In Marx you will always find a word that could have been spoken today.

Even today, Marx is in the front ranks of active fighters for the social restructuring of the world.

...Whatever the combination of words--those or the countless multitude of other combinations--in which we express the enduring freshness and /eternal modernity/ [this and other passages between slantlines published in italics] of Marx' thought, it is always desirable to back those words up with a reliable, accurate, detailed, specific account of the Marxist truths.

First, it is necessary to ensure that, despite the growing flow of all kinds of information, the number of people reading Marx /himself,/ not merely popular rehashes of him, constantly increases.

Second, we should not underestimate the fact that the exceptional methodological might of Marx' genius has been the battering ram before which, despite decades of stubborn counterattacks, neither the ramparts of bourgeois apologetics nor the towers of positivist scholasticism have been able to hold out. Even bourgeois social science, in its own way, has felt its influence. Nowadays even people who have a fierce hatred of Marx the revolutionary

acknowledge their respect for Marx the researcher. Many supposedly objective authors who remain loyal to the treasures of the capitalist class but who eagerly "in public" sing along with the chorus eulogizing the great author of "Capital" have appeared in the West. These individuals' motives may differ, but the leitmotiv of their talk consists in drowning the rebellious essence of Marxism in praise and compliments and consigning its founder a little more securely to...Madame Tussaud's museum.

There is another side effect here. The compliment of a reactionary ideologist is like the kiss of Judas. It is sometimes offered with the intention of creating a false impression and causing misconceptions about the person to whom it is addressed. That is why it is never superfluous to repeat the lines of Lessing that Lenin quoted with reference to Marx: "Who does not praise Klopstock? But would everyone read him? No. We want to be read less, but read more diligently!" ("Complete Collected Works, vol 1, p 131).

It is now traditional to turn to the image of Prometheus in order to imagine the cardinal role that Marx has played in the history of the human spirit. Marx was inspired by the example of this mythological hero, who stole fire from the gods for people, introduced them to material light and warmth as the guarantee of spiritual light and warmth, and suffered for doing so. Nonetheless, what Marx himself did is more majestic than the ancient Greeks' stories about Prometheus. Marx gave the proletariat, the people, mankind, something that neither Prometheus nor any other hero could give—precise knowledge of themselves and thereby of the conditions of their liberation, something that could not be borrowed from anyone, that did not previously exist and that had to be /created anew./ In all previous history there is nothing that can even be compared with Marx' work. "The philosophy that Marx gave the working class was a revolution in the history of social thought," Yu. V. Andropov's article "The Teaching of Karl Marx and Certain Questions of Socialist Building in the USSR" says: "Mankind did not know even a small part of what it learned about itself thanks to Marxism. Marx' teaching, represented in the organic integrity of dialectical and historical materialism, political economy, and the theory of scientific communism, was a true revolution in world outlook and at the same time illuminated the way for the profoundest social revolutions."

The edifice of Marxism is majestic. You can scarcely become a literate Marxist by reading some little book, even if it is written with talent. The inevitable destiny of Marxism is its systematic, everyday study by increasing numbers of people, unceasing living functioning in the revolutionary creative practice of the masses, and constant enrichment on the basis of the accumulating material of science and of life. It is this that is its real being, which is incompatible with any dogmatism.

People sometimes say to us communists: "Is it correct to follow now, in the late 20th century, a doctrine formulated over a century ago?" But they essentially offer nothing (indeed, cannot offer anything!) as a real alternative. As a rule, the "age argument" about Marxism is the main argument heard from those who would like to tempt mankind into chasing after the short-lived butterflies of the sundry frivolous concepts that bourgeois social

thought tirelessly produces, after what Lenin called lifeless fashion. But can the "age" of a truth affect its merit? Doesn't the reverse happen: The more a truth is borne out by reality, the more valuable it is. Marxists by no means cling to every possible detail in Marx' teaching, for the details are naturally subject to the erosion of time, and they do not insist on the purely contingent [sobytiyny] assessments, which have receded into the past along with the situations that engendered them. At the same time they are well aware of the strength of the Marxist dialectical materialist method and have seen for themselves that this method is mankind's main spiritual gain in all its many millennia of history. And what goes for the method also goes in principle for the theory.

In order to demonstrate the topicality of Marx' teaching it is by no means essential to seek out new pages, or not fully studied pages in that teaching. I think it is better to travel another, more familiar, but ever-new path--to highlight yet again propositions that would seem to be familiar to everyone but at the same time retain their incontrovertibility and topicality. In order to narrow the subject of this article still further, we will name the three facets of Marxism which will be examined in it and which are representative of the teaching.

What are these facets?

First, Marx' concept of alienation and exploitation of man by man, which represents a scientific sentence on capitalism.

Second, Marx' teaching on the worldwide historic mission of the working class--the social force called upon to execute this sentence and to head the creation of the new society.

Third, the vitality of Marx' ideas and their scientific effectiveness in the analysis of the socialism that has now taken shape and has been fully established as a social system.

Before embarking on the exposition of the first question that has been raised, let us recall Engels' well-known thought that /Marxism found in the history of the development of labor the key to understanding the whole history of society/ (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 21, p 317).

Labor, whose simplest elements are, according to Marx, purposeful activity, the means of labor, and the object of labor, represents the working person's modification of the matter of nature with the aim of imparting to it a form needed by man. In labor man in one way or another reveals and develops his nature. You can judge a craftsman from his product since he has partially "objectified" himself by investing something of his inner "self" in an external object. This giving, this "transfusion" of the subjective abilities into an object, this transformation of them from abilities intrinsic to the subject into properties of an external object expresses a general peculiarity of labor. Otherwise the adaptation of an object to human needs is simply impossible. In turn, the consumption of the created product, the return to the working person of what he gave to the object during the process of labor,

is the reappropriation by man of his "essential forces" and fuels the constantly repeated assertion of man as the subject of production. This process bears the character of an assimilation, a "subjectivization" of the object, and this itself is an important precondition of "objectification." The extremely close interweaving, interpenetration, interdependence of these processes can be observed in life.

Though they are closely linked and presuppose each other, the aforementioned elements of human activity are at the same time different and are sometimes separated in space and time. The act of the "objectification" of the subject in labor may be detached, isolated from the act of the assimilation of "subjectivization" of the product of labor. It is this peculiarity of labor--the objective demarcation of manufacture and consumption, of output and assimilation--that makes it possible to delay returning to the producer his goods in the private ownership society.

The "objectification" by man of his abilities in the labor process (the "subject-object" relationship) exists and will continue to do so as long as social production exists. As for the confiscation of the material embodiment, the encapsulation [sgustok] of labor, and its product in favor of the nonworker--which is what /social alienation/ is in relations among people--this arose at a particular stage of society's development and is transient and temporary, albeit very long-lived.

Under the conditions of the primordial community, which possessed extremely primitive tools and produced only barely enough to maintain the existence of its members, there could be no question of the alienation of products of labor. The feeble development of production forces, the low level of labor productivity, the limited nature of practice, and ignorance of social and natural laws made man entirely dependent on nature. As well as that dependence, there was also a rigid dependence on the community itself. And the community was by no means a free association of comprehensively developed individuals. It was a collective of weak creatures, defenseless on their own, for whom union was the only way to acquire the minimum strength for the struggle against nature for existence. Alienation did not exist simply because there was nothing to alienate in favor of anyone.

Private ownership and slave-owning arose on the basis of higher labor productivity that made it possible to secure some product surplus to the minimum resources for life. A group of individuals (which consolidates itself to form an exploiter class) confiscates property in its own favor because it makes people, the working people, its property by using their implements of labor. A similar situation persists under feudalism. The only difference is that here the peasant is in a state of personal dependence on the feudal lord as an appendage to the land that is the latter's property and to the means of cultivating that land.

Under the conditions of capitalist production the working person emerges from personal dependence and can no longer be anyone's property. At the same time he is deprived of the means of production. He gains personal freedom, but without its material basis--a freedom that is illusory since economic

dependence on the owner of the means and objects of labor persists. Ending up over and over again in the hands not of the producer, the working person, but of the owner of the means of production, the product of labor "is in opposition to labor as an /alien being,/ as a /force outside the power/ of the producer" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 42 p 88). In the process "the implementation of labor...its transformation into reality constitutes the /exclusion/ of the worker /from reality,/ and objectification constitutes the /loss of the object and enslavement by the object/..." (ibidem).

What the worker produces by no means diminishes but, on the contrary, increases the force that dominates and enslaves him. As Marx wrote in the original version of "Capital," "The emphasis is not on /objectification (materialization)/ but on /alienation (entfremdet-, / Entaussert-, Veraussertsein), on the belonging of the huge material might that social labor itself has counterposed to itself as one of its elements--on the belonging of this might not to the worker, but to the personified conditions of production, that is, to capital" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 46, par ii, p 347). The product of labor--the object created by the hands of man--begins to dominate man. "...The more a worker exhausts himself at work, the mightier the alien material world that he himself has created against himself becomes" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 42, p 88) and the poorer he himself becomes materially and spiritually.

Back before the October Revolution Lenin, using figures from an investigation of Russia's factories and plants, calculated the correlation between the capitalist's profit and the proletarian's wage. At that time there were 2.25 million workers and their total wages were \$555.7 million per year. The average annual wage was maintained at the level of R246 (R20.50 per month). The capitalists' profit reached R568.7 million per year. Thus each worker brought the capitalist R252--more than he received. "This," Lenin wrote, "shows that the worker works /less than half/ the day for himself and /more than half the day/ for the capitalist" ("Complete Collected Works," vol 22, p 25).

Far sharper contrasts can be seen nowadays. While in the mid-19th century the American worker worked about 3/5 of the time for himself and 2/5 for the capitalist, a century later the worker worked 2/3 of the time to produce surplus value and only 1/3 for himself. In the third quarter of the 20th century the absolute gap between the average entrepreneur's income and the average wage increased by a factor of 3 in the United States, 6 in France, and 10 in Japan. The degree of exploitation particularly intensified in sectors where the influence of the scientific and technical revolution is being felt more markedly and the proportion of skilled workers is higher. /In creating a relatively small base for his own personal well-being the proletarian simultaneously creates at best a similar (but usually a greater) economic base for his exploitation./

After World War I, and especially after World War II, marked changes occurred in the internal life of the economically developed capitalist countries. A positive aspect of scientific and technical progress along with the powerful influence of the world socialist system and an important consequence of the intensification of the economic, political, and ideological struggle of the proletariat, which felt it had a reliable prop in socialism organized in

state form, was the fact that the exploiters in a number of industrial Western powers began to cease to encroach on the minimum livelihood of the employed worker. The certain improvement in working people's material prosperity in absolute terms prompted the monopolies' propaganda, for the umpteenth time, to launch a vocal discussion of the "refutation" of Marx' theory of the exploitation of the working class. Claims of this sort are based on establishing merely the banal fact that conditions of capitalist production in the last decades of the 20th century are not as they were when Marx analyzed them. An old story that our adversaries prefer to forget is being repeated--what is being carried out is similar to the attack launched after Engels' death by the number one revisionist Bernstein against Marxism and the "theory of impoverishment," which is presented in a distorted and exaggerated form.

Let us take the current situation in the "border areas" of capitalism in the geographical sense--that is, the countries that are the target of exploitation by the developed imperialist states and the transnational corporations. Despite the collapse of the colonial system, capital is still unceremonious in these countries and is clinging to the traditional methods of making a profit. The liberated countries essentially remain in the position of imperialism's raw material base. Raw materials extracted from Asia, Africa, and Latin America account for 90 percent of Japan's supplies and 75 percent of West Europe's. Though they have treble the population of the capitalist countries, the young states produce 6 times less industrial output, and 15-16 times less in per capita terms. The average wage of workers with a particular skill in Asia is 10 times lower than the wage of similar workers in the United States.

In contrast with the developing world, the mechanism of impoverishment in the economically developed capitalist countries has become more complex and more covert. The fairly high indicators for average per capita consumption that have been achieved there make it possible to cleverly disguise the fact that "poverty is growing not in the physical but in the social sense--that is, in the sense of the discrepancy between the rising level of the bourgeoisie's needs and the needs of all society and the living standard of the working people's masses" (V. I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," vol 4, p 208).

The increase in the prosperity of hired workers by comparison with the pre-war level which has occurred in the developed capitalist countries as a result of scientific and technical progress (under the pressure of the proletariat's organized struggle and the development of socialism in a number of countries) is common knowledge. However, one cannot help seeing that over this same period the income of the capitalist monopolies has increased beyond all comparison with the improvement in working people's material situation. Very definite conclusions follow from this comparison alone. The first (and simplest) of them is the increase in the degree of exploitation of hired personnel in factories and plants, since the proportion of social wealth appropriated by the capitalists can increase only for that reason.

Alongside the old, traditional methods of exploitation, new methods have appeared, and their emergence, in turn, has produced new forms of impoverishment of the working people's masses.

The increasing application of scientific and technical achievements in production is naturally leading to a rapid growth in the proportion of intellectual operations, to a certain "intellectualization" of labor. Under capitalism this means that /not so much the working person's physical abilities as his mental abilities are gradually increasingly becoming the target of exploitation./ The identification of this new source of profit substantially enriches the Marxist idea of the mechanism of the capitalist oppression of the masses and alienation of labor.

On the one hand the role and weight of working people engaged in intellectual labor (the intelligentsia) as a target of exploitation increase. This means that the labor of all new groups of participants in production is sucked into the sphere of exploitation. On the other hand, at the very same time there is an increase in the opportunity for the wider utilization in the industrially developed capitalist countries of forms of social enslavement based on the "reorientation" of exploitation, which used chiefly to exhaust the worker's muscles, toward exhaustion of the nervous system, which is less noticeable for the workers but more productive for the exploiters.

Having "discovered" in the increasing exploitation of working people's mental energy a new and more effective source for the making of profit, capitalism has become convinced that it is disadvantageous for itself to curtail the consumption of products satisfying physical and the most elementary cultural needs. And what is more: Since, with modern equipment, considerably more profit can be "squeezed" from a skill than can be extracted from physical strength, the masters of the monopolies prefer to deal with a well fed, and often also semi-intellectual worker. Meanwhile, the "customary" curses of capitalism--massive unemployment, which is becoming chronic, homelessness, malnutrition, and poverty, in the direct sense of the word, yawning against the background of the store-window luxury of the bourgeois world--persist or else deepen.

In some cases the bourgeoisie, proceeding from its own egoistic interests, may even be interested in the increased satisfaction of standardized mass needs. At the same time /what remains outside the confines of those standards are the newly arisen needs,/ which grow rapidly as a result of the general growth of education and of the /scientific and technical revolution./ Capital obtains a gain when it assesses the increasing economic "yield" of the new abilities, while freezing in every possible way (ideological ways included) the idea of needs.

Just as exploitation does not vanish, the limitation of working people's consumption does not vanish either. But now it is aimed primarily at limiting the /social/ development of the exploited, though this development is becoming a necessary consequence and condition of the successful course of modern production. It is only the absence, as yet, of /direct quantitative/ measures of the degree of satisfaction of social needs that enables the bourgeoisie to conceal the "secret" of the exploitation of the type of the second half of the 20th century. This is utilized by bourgeois propagandists, who often talk of capitalism's allegedly greater potential in improving living

standards, proceeding only from a comparison of the /physical amounts/ of products consumed in the industrially developed Western powers and in certain socialist states. This social demagoguery diverts the attention of a considerable section of the capitalist countries' population from the /working people's increasing sociocultural underconsumption/ and obscures the fact of the considerable /lag in the development of the personality/ of each person behind the potential /already created/ for this by modern production.

The inclusion nowadays in the value of manpower of the considerable funds required to cover the wide range of new sociocultural needs not satisfied by capitalism testifies to the need to change the concept of "social poverty." /In certain countries today capitalism can avoid making profit out of the clear malnutrition of the masses, although in this regard it can scarcely miss a suitable opportunity. But it increasingly prefers to make profit out of their chronic spiritual hunger. Only the form of alienation has changed--the essence remains the same./

Man does not live by bread alone. That ancient truth sounds exceptionally fresh today. Along with a certain degree of prosperity, the contemporary state of production forces presupposes high cultural and technical standards on the part of the production worker. The needs whose satisfaction capitalism prevented a century ago and the needs via whose satisfaction it makes profit today differ in origin, form, and the objects toward which they are directed, but they are equally vital to the individual /if the individual remains at the level of contemporary cultural and historical development./ The change in the form and direction of exploitation in no way shakes the Marxist concept of the alienation of labor but, on the contrary, bolsters it with new facts.

Capitalist production under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution creates a huge mass of people who occupy a proletarian position and are at the same time engaged in intellectual labor. While squeezing more and more surplus value from their intellectual resources, capitalist production at the same time objectively creates a huge and expanding world of spiritual needs that are henceforth no longer the privilege of a limited and fundamentally bourgeois minority but become the purpose and meaning of the life of the large new army of the exploited. There is a broadening of the front of protest and struggle against the bourgeois social system, which, though it brings new needs into being, at the same time does not create the conditions for their satisfaction by the majority of the population. After all, the direct aim of the capitalist form of production--the increase of value--does not coincide with the absolute aim of production--the creation of objects to satisfy human needs. /The crisis of the bourgeois mode of production is also a crisis of spiritual production./ Dissatisfaction and protest embrace working people engaged in both physical and intellectual labor. The fundamental contradiction of capitalism is becoming increasingly universal not only in theory but also in practice.

Is not the need for free creative labor, the production and technical conditions for whose realization ripen even within the framework of modern

capitalist production under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution, not a vital material human need? The creation of the social conditions for this, above all the elimination of exploitation, is on the agenda, but this is possible only with the victory of socialism.

Marx perceives in the constant alienation of the products of labor, of the main results or the encapsulations of human activity, the transformation of that activity itself into a process that does not belong to man, into an unceasing "self-alienation" of the process of labor. "So the worker feels himself only outside labor, and in the process of labor he feels out of touch with himself. He is at home [u sebya] when he is not working; when he is working he is no longer at home. Because of this his labor is not voluntary but coercive; it is /forced labor./ It is not a satisfaction of the need for labor, but only a /means/ of satisfying all other needs, but not the need for labor? (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 42, pp 90-91). Belonging not to the worker but to the capitalist, the worker's activity ceases to be his own spontaneous activity, "it is the worker's loss of himself" (ibidem, p 91). Therefore /the exploiter system objectively cultivates an attitude toward labor that perceives it as an alien duty unworthy of man./ The aversion felt for labor for the exploiter is sometimes transferred to all labor. The obverse of the material alienation of the product and the process of labor is the moral alienation of the working person from labor.

Production life, Marx says, is a special form of activity characteristic of mankind alone and the special generic life of man as a social being. So the alienation of labor means the alienation of generic life, of the social principle, and its forced character makes a truly human form of activity merely the means of maintaining physical existence. Exploitation devastates man and makes him alien to his own essence—labor. Man's activity and labor lose independent meaning and value unless they promise an immediate utilitarian result. Thus man's dependence mainly on his physical (and in origin animal) needs is bolstered.

"A direct sequence of the fact that man is alienated from the product of his labor, from his activity, and from his generic essence," Marx assets, "is the /alienation of man/ from /man./ When a man is opposed to himself, he is opposed by /other/ men. What can be said about man's attitude toward his own labor, toward the product of his labor, and toward himself can also be said about man's attitude toward other people, and also toward the labor and the objects of labor of other people" (ibidem, p 94).

The reproduction of the foundations of alienation by contemporary capitalism and the simultaneous evolution of bourgeois society superpose more and more new contradictions upon each other. Economic barriers between individuals are a norm of life. Alienation has a great many faces. There is alienation between old and young, educated and semiliterate, men and women, white and "colored," workers and students, people engaged in creative labor and people engaged in uncreative labor, managers and living robots, civilians and military men, "doves" and "hawks," and so on and so forth. The ruling elite makes skillful use of this diversity. Its "treatment" of the ills of bourgeois society boils down to two methods: on the one hand to local anesthesia, to anesthetizing by means of a tiny economic injection or psychological

indoctrination; on the other hand, to acupuncture, to attracting the public's attention to those sections of the infected organism that are least connected with the cause of the infection. For what purpose? To avoid a serious operation.

At first it may appear that the fact of the alienation of labor has a pernicious effect on the working people alone and that the exploiters, who appropriate the product, thereby grow rich and have every opportunity to improve themselves as individuals. However, the dialectics of the process are such that the foundation of the propertied classes' prosperity--alienated labor--is at the same time a force that deforms and dehumanizes the propertied classes themselves.

Though proletarians who have a negative attitude toward labor for the exploiters nevertheless implement their human nature in the process of the production of useful objects, the bourgeois chiefly play the role of consumers of the fruits of other people's labor. In the strict sense of the word, this is not a human but an animal activity, albeit one that has arisen on the basis of social production and has assumed a certain social form. Clearly, this too is "man's loss of himself." "Right from the start the worker here stands higher than the capitalist insofar as the latter is rooted in this process of alienation and finds in that process his absolute satisfaction, whereas the worker, as its victim, from the outset rebels against it and sees it as a process of enslavement" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 49, p 47).

Since the capitalist had to fulfill the functions of overseer and leader of the production process, his activity gained a certain content, although the process of labor itself merely played the role of a means of increasing value. "The self-increase of capital--the creation of surplus value--is therefore the determining, dominant, and all-devouring goal of the capitalist and the absolute impulse (trieb) and content of his activity, in fact, it is merely the rationalized impulse and the goal of a collector of treasures, an utterly impoverished and abstract content that compels the capitalist, on the one hand, to operate under the slavish conditions of the capitalist relationship just like the worker, although, on the other hand, to operate at the opposite pole" (ibidem). The capitalist too is not free to display his creative human potential.

However, it does not follow from these indisputable statements that all classes are equally interested in the elimination of alienation. That standpoint is zealously preached by the ideologists of the bourgeoisie and of rightwing opportunism with the aim of depriving the workers of their class purposefulness and disorganizing the political struggle of the working people's masses. The exploiter class not only does not feel the need for liberation, but resists this with all its strength, and so only the revolutionary proletariat is capable of implementing a socialist revolution and destroying the foundations of the alienation of labor and all varieties of social alienation.

revolutionary /proletarian socialism/ or communism (Marxism)" (V. I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," vol 26, p 48). Even the "Communist Manifesto," which appeared in February 1848, "outline with brilliant clarity and vividness the new world outlook consistent materialism embracing the sphere of social life too, dialectics as the most comprehensive and profound teaching on development, and the theory of the class struggle and the worldwide historic revolutionary role of the proletariat, the creator of the new, communist society" (ibidem). Since then the question of the historic mission of the working class has been the center of attention of social sciences and political practice, and its topicality is not abating.

The proletariat is a special class without equal in history which possesses /two/ main features, which determine all the rest.

First of all it is /unpropertied,/ that is, deprived of the means of production and in constant need of a livelihood. Naturally, by virtue of its objective condition, provided it is clearly aware of that condition, the proletariat is bound to be an opponent of exploiter private ownership and any social system based on it, and vitally interested in radically changing its own social and material position. "Proletarians have nothing they need to protect," the "Communist Manifesto" states, "they must destroy everything that has so far protected and safeguarded private ownership" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 4, p 434).

It is precisely this that explains the class-conscious worker's categorical rejection of all the traditions of the private ownership society that have no general human content, and the resolution, consistency, implacability, and radicalism in the struggle against any forms of inequality, oppression, exploitation, material need, and spiritual poverty. It is precisely this truth that is expressed in the uniquely meaningful final words of the first program document of creative Marxism: "Let the ruling classes tremble before the communist revolution. Proletarians have nothing to lose in it but their chains. And they will gain the whole world." (ibidem, p 459).

Of course, we would be wrong if we were to claim that the listed qualities are entirely characteristic of the proletariat alone. /Slaves/ were unpropertied and deprived even of the right to dispose of their own person. /Peasant serfs/ were in a similar position--though, it is true, they had partial economic independence. But why did their risings, which sometimes shook thrones and led to the downfall of huge empires, never possess an explicit positive, still less scientific, program or lead to the creation of a new system? Why was the ideological banner of major peasant movements either views borrowed from other classes (for instance, so-called peasant czarism in Russia), or religion, adapted to the needs of the moment, or--at best--utopian socialism?

Mainly for two reasons. First, the majority of working people before capitalism did not see social slavery as a /necessary property/ of the given social system. Its manifestations were usually held to be dependent on the /personal/ qualities of the slaveholder or serf owner. Only the undermining of the foundations of the patriarchal system, the rupture of the working person's connection with a particular place and a particular exploiters, and the certain socialization and therefore /exposure/ of exploitation that capitalism effects

create the conditions for an understanding of private property relations as a /system/ hostile to the working people and for the really firm association and consolidation of the proletarians as unpropertied people.

Second, it is not enough to be unpropertied. "Marx repeatedly pointed to one dictum of Sismondi's that is tremendously important," Lenin wrote. "The proletarians of the ancient world, this dictum says, lived at society's expense. Modern society lives at the proletarians' expense.

"A class of unpropertied people, but not working people, is incapable of overthrowing the exploiters. Only the class of proletarians, which contains all society, is capable of carrying out a social revolution" ("Complete Collected Works," vol 16, p 69). Unpropertied or almost unpropertied working people such as slaves or small-scale producers possess a colossal revolutionary potential, but they are incapable of /remaking/ the antagonistic class system. And the point here is not that slaves are ignorant or that small-scale owners are constrained by their miserly private property, although those are indeed factors of considerable importance: The point is /that neither the former nor the latter can in principle be the initiators of the building of a new society since they do not represent a type of organization of labor appropriate to that society./

The working class is not only deprived of the means of production, not only suffers from an insecure existence--that explains a great deal, but it will scarcely explain the main thing--thanks to the fundamentally new character of its production activity under conditions of capitalism, it is the first of the exploited working people's classes to play the role of /subject (creator) of advanced social relations./ It is a collectivist class, an organized and organizing force by virtue of its very position in modern mechanized production. That is its second essential feature.

Precapitalist modes of production, for all the tremendous differences between them, were based on routine technology, on relatively inefficient individually used tools that limited the potential for both development and the application of the natural and technical sciences. Irrespective of the type of ownership (communal or private) and the forms of organization of labor (joint or individual), working people were disunited /technologically./ With the assertion of private ownership as the dominant economic relationships, /working people's technological isolation was bolstered by social isolation/ and the economic conditions of production produced and consolidated alienation in people's relationships.

Only capitalism makes qualitative changes in this setup. Arising as a result of the highest development of private ownership relations, at the same time it cannot change the organization of labor. Even in manufacture, which gathers together beneath a single roof a number of specialized workers, it becomes joint in character. The technological disunity is finally undermined by the introduction of machinery, by the transformation of production into a system of interacting mechanisms in which man himself is incorporated only as a kind of depersonalized component. The means and objects of the labor that unites in a single process and in the same premises tens, hundreds or thousands

of working people become /social/ in the organizational and technological respects. A contradiction develops between the social nature of production and the private form of the appropriation of the means of production and its results.

The production process, which deprives the worker of the better part of his time, strength, abilities, and soul, molds him as a link, as an element in the functioning of the collective's manpower. At the enterprise he interacts with other workers as a single element in the general technological process, as an [word indistinct] individual embodiment of its /necessity./ The worker's labor mentality is molded under the direct and constant influence of production that is increasingly rationally organized--taking into account the latest achievements of scientific and technical thought--that is growing in scale, and that disciplines and instills the capacity for discipline outside the sphere of direct labor also.

The economic and everyday aspect of the working person's activity competes with this production organization aspect. Outside the enterprise, at home, in the sphere of the satisfaction of personal needs, the proletarian is left to himself. What exerts the dominant influence on him in this sphere is not the iron organization of large-scale mechanized production but the mind-corroding anarchy of private ownership /property relations/ and the influence of the bourgeois or petit bourgeois environment. By the inexorable logic of bourgeois social relations, man feels free only in his daily life. The worker's consciousness is split and he often does not know whether labor can be regarded as part of life, but he is not entirely sure either that life is eating, sleeping, and entertainment.... The process of labor shapes in him a collectivist, the process of appropriation shapes an individualist. /His proletarian nature must triumph./

Consciousness of the hopelessness of the position within the system of production and economic relations that dominates under capitalism fuels in the working class a disposition toward transformations and strengthens its desire to make its historic contribution to the continuous process of the change and improvement of forms of social life. Accustomed to modern technology and collective labor, having divined the essence of the age-old exploitation of man by man, and having revealed the best degree of preparation under present conditions for organized struggle, the proletariat is the "intellectual and moral motive force and physical executant" (V. I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," vol 26, p 73) of the transformations that are associated with the process, which began under capitalism, of the all-around socialization of labor and that can be carried through only by forms of social structure such as socialism and communism.

All the extremely rich history of the workers movement can be represented as a complex, contradictory process, full of swift changes and sometimes of unexpected turnabouts but steadily increasing, of the transformation of the proletariat from a "class in itself" to a "class for itself" and of the proletariat's implementation of its worldwide historic mission.

Both those terms are from Marx and Engels, who used them meaningfully to designate different stages in the maturity of the working class. It acts as a /"class in itself"/ when it has not yet gained class self-consciousness (or else--this also happens--it has lost it temporarily for some reason), and pursues a vegetative way of life, contenting itself with an economic struggle to partially improve its position as the stratum of exploited hired working people or else taking part in the political struggle under the aegis of social forces that are, in class terms, alien to it.

By contrast, the proletariat as a /"class for itself"/ clearly delimits its own interests from those of other classes of society, is capable of identifying its real and potential enemies and allies, is sufficiently educated to understand its position as the vanguard of social progress in the modern era, has grasped the principles of its own scientific revolutionary ideology--Marxism-Leninism--and knows how to apply them in practice. An essential condition of the proletariat's becoming and remaining a "class for itself" is, according to Lenin, the /combination of scientific socialism with the workers movement,/ the elevation of spontaneous activeness to the level of conscious organization, which is associated with the formation of independent workers political parties, and tireless and systematic ideological, political, and organizational work by those parties among the masses.

After the accomplishing of a socialist revolution, the working class ceases to be an unpropertied class, /exchanging negative economic unity based on an insecure existence,/ which is characteristic of the exploited proletariat of the capitalist countries, for /positive economic unity/ based on social ownership of the means, objects, and products of labor. The socialist countries' working class denies itself as a /proletariat/ within the national framework, but remains part of the world proletariat. One cannot agree with those who, proceeding from the fact of the replacement of private ownership by social ownership, essentially dispute that the working class of a socialist country possesses a number of essential /general proletarian/ features. First, the transformation of the proletariat into the collective owner of the means of production does not make any working a personal owner of them and, moreover, that possibility is gradually excluded for representatives of other strata of the population too, since the only source of all personal income is personal labor and the most important principle of society is "whoever does not work, does not eat." Second, at the beginning of socialist building the working class of socialist countries /alone/ inherits the large-scale capitalist organizational and technical association, advanced urban culture, and the aggregate of the technical and technological relations of large-scale mechanized production, which it develops and extends on the basis of social ownership and scientific and technical progress.

An error characteristic of dogmatists is underestimation of the role of the working class as the /subject/ of the process, which began under capitalism, of the /socialization of labor,/ which must be both economic and technological in character. The error stems from the wrongful identification of the interests, potential, and historical roles of the proletariat and the other working people's classes that are its allies. The /majority/ of the unpropertied strata (or those close to them) are interested in /economic/ socialization--which overthrows the dominance of big capital--in the modern era,

but only the working class is capable of /technologically/ socializing production, setting up new /organizational/ relations, the accounting of material resources, and the monitoring of their utilization, introducing the plan principle into production, and creating a /scientific/ system for the management of economically socialized activity.

Analyzing Soviet experience of implementing the "Communist Manifesto's" idea regarding the organization of the proletariat as the ruling class, Lenin noted two fundamental points: After taking power, the working class maintains, preserves, and strengthens it, like any other class, /first/ by changing the attitude toward ownership and /second/ by a new constitution (see "Complete Collected Works," vol 40, p 270).

It is common knowledge that historically the initial acts of the October Revolution were the transfer of the full panoply of state power to the hands of the soviets for worker, soldier, and peasant deputies and the address to the peoples and governments of the warring countries offering to conclude a just, democratic peace. These were acts of a political, /superstructural/ character, which, during certain debates of the fifties on the problem of the base and superstructure, prompted statements regarding the emergence and existence for a few months--until the nationalization of industry in 1918--of merely a proletarian superstructure without...an appropriate base. If people did not forget that the Soviet power's second--after the Decree on Peace--legislative document was the Decree on Land, they made comments in the vein that the nationalization of land which that decree proclaimed was not a socialist but a general democratic measure implemented within the framework of a bourgeois state. To claim this was to wrongfully identify the social content of measures of similar form carried out by different classes with, moreover, opposing interests.

It will be recalled that Lenin regarded this measure not only as the most radical act eliminating vestiges of feudalism and serfdom but also as a means of creating /the most flexible/ system for a transition to socialism in farming (see "Complete Collected Works," vol 37, p 326). As M. V. Fofanova recalls, he was profoundly concerned to find the peasant instructions a "little in" [zaruchka] that would make it possible later to refashion in a bolshevik manner the socialist revolutionary idea of socialization contained in those instructions. This "in" was the demand to place the large intensive arable and stockraising farms, as not being subject to division, at the sole disposal of the state or communities. This demand made it possible to map out, even before the socialization of industry, a real way toward the creation of a socialist sector in agriculture (see "History of the CPSU," vol 3, book 1, Moscow, 1967, p 336).

Thus the position of the working class as the ruling class began to be consolidated not only in the political but also in the economic sphere, in the sphere of ownership relations, on practically the first day of Soviet power (the Decree on Land was submitted to the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets 25 October and adopted 26 October 1917).

The proletariat uses the political power it has won not in order to transform itself into a class towering over and enslaving other classes but merely in order to end any class domination, any enslavement. It does not seek to perpetuate the position in society that it has gained. In all the history of its existence the Soviet working class has done everything to extend that position, as the requisite material and spiritual preconditions ripen, to other strata of associated working people.

Nowadays the Soviet working class is 2/3 of the country's employed population, a huge human mass welded together by the collectivist nature of the technology and organization of labor in industry and by social ownership of the means of production, and is the majority the working people. It is a mighty detachment of working people of whom 4/5 are people with secondary (completed and uncompleted) and higher education, and 2/3 of its new recruits are young men and women who have undergone training in the vocational and technical education system. It is a category of working people engaged in socialist production whose labor is increasingly being filled with intellectual content. The modern worker is typified by the combination of functions of physical and intellectual labor, which ends the still current (including among some scientists) prejudice that the working class has to be totally connected with the performance of operations requiring chiefly muscular effort. /Neither Marx, nor Engels, nor Lenin ever permitted such a narrow interpretation of the question./ By all its existence and by its achievements on the frontiers of the 5-year plans the USSR's working class is asserting itself as the active champion of the scientific and technical revolution and is, along with the kolkhoz peasantry and the people's intelligentsia, the vehicle of Soviet society's intellectual potential.

As is well known, at the 26th CPSU Congress the quantitative and qualitative changes in the composition and position of the working class were examined in order to establish the new features in the rapprochement among all classes and social groups of Soviet society. "This is an objective but by no means spontaneous process," it was noted at the congress. "An important role is played in it by the social policy of the party and the state. Our aim is to create a society in which there will be no division of people into classes. And it can definitely be said that we are making gradual but confident progress toward that great aim."

Assessing experience of developing our society in recent decades, the 26th CPSU Congress put forward the thesis that the /formation of a classless social structure will take place in the main within the historical framework of mature socialism./ It follows from this that the young classless society, when it first appears, will be (for how long it is now impossible to say) not communist but /socialist./ However, its classlessness does not mean that this society will be socially unstructured. The overcoming of class differences is still not equivalent to complete social homogeneity, and the attainment of that homogeneity depends on the elimination of the sector of manual, unskilled, and heavy physical labor and on the gradual overcoming of the socially significant differences between people engaged predominantly in physical labor and those engaged predominantly in intellectual labor, in monotonous labor and in creative labor, in organizational labor and in performance [ispolnitelnyy trud]. These remnants of the old division of labor will for a long time

influence the social structure even in the classless socialist society. Clearly, qualification differences between people must assume a relatively greater significance in that society, and the society itself will presumably be, /as it were, cellular/ in character: After all, there will be an increase in the influence of the various kinds of socialist labor collectives and mass associations of citizens rallied together and headed by the party organizations. There can be no doubt that the role of the latter, as concentrated expressers and continuators of the worldwide historic mission of the working class, must increase. But it would be one-sided to interpret the building of a classless socialist society as the disappearance of the working class alone or else as merely its merger with the kolkhoz peasantry. It is a question of a border process of the mass--and communist in its thrust--transformation of /all/ social groups of working people without exception, of a historic shift that is organically connected with the implementation of proletarian ideals, not of any others.

Illusions about the future are contraindicated for the working class and the workers movement. Any lack of political soberness and realism, the proclamation of slogans that are known to be infeasible, and feigned cheerfulness in propaganda have a pernicious effect on its enlightenment. After all, the transformation of the working class from a "class in itself" into a "class for itself" under the conditions of the unabating ideological struggle is an extremely uneven process that experiences ebbs and flows, rises and falls, depending on the ability to counter the bourgeoisie's intrigues and its increasingly sophisticated methods of manipulating the masses' consciousness.

Our class adversaries, it was said at the 26th CPSU Congress, learn from their defeats. One of the lessons they have learned from the collapse of the "models" of counterrevolution in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968 is that no one can manage to weaken the people's power without substantial influence on the working class and without indoctrinating it in an antisocialist spirit and at least partially disorientating it. This largely explains the line of conduct of socialism's enemies in Poland, who, taking advantage of the major errors and abuses of the former Polish leadership, hypocritically went to the "defense" of the workers' interests, pitting them against their own class party and the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a whole and demagogically equating the people's democratic state as "employer" and the capitalist employer.

Doesn't this greatly resemble the pose of "defender" of human rights that thievish American imperialism was diligently rehearsing only a little while ago? We are faced with a clear intention to return the working class of a country that is forced in a grave situation to deal with the extremely complex ups and downs of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism from its condition as a "class for itself" to its old, long-surpassed slavish condition of a "class in itself."

The crisis phenomena in Poland have still not been eliminated. Only future historians will be able to analyze all the twists of a course of events that is so multilayered and dramatic. However, it is already generally recognized

that the lowering of the level of class self-consciousness among a section of Polish workers took place because of a number of circumstances, including not only the extreme feebleness of ideological and political work among the masses, but also the utter groundlessness and utopianism of the goal set by the former Polish leadership for the seventies--the building of a developed socialist society before the final solution of the historical "who-whom?" question in favor of working people. The Polish events again showed with the utmost cogency how important is the theoretical interpretation of the stages in the formation and development of the new social system. Interpretation according to Marx, and not otherwise.

3

Marx' brilliant insights and the clear and concise outline given in his works of the foundations of the future social structure were an invaluable contribution to the proletarian philosophy of social optimism. They have held up to all-around testing in the crucible of Great October and the subsequent socialist revolutions and in the practice of the creation of the new society in the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries.

Marx' formulation of the question of the form that the political organization of society will assume when the working class comes to power is of truly worldwide historic significance.

To what kind of transformation will statehood be subjected in the communist society, he asks, or what social functions analogous to the present state functions will remain them?

He formulates the answer, which, according to Marx, can be given only scientifically, in the spirit of his thesis: Freedom consists in transforming the state from an organ standing over society to an organ entirely subordinated to society. "Between the capitalist and the communist society there lies a period of the revolutionary transformation of the former into the latter," Marx writes. "A political transitional period also corresponds to this period, and the state of this period cannot be anything other than a /revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat"/ (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 19, p 27).

As the practice of socialist building shows, it is precisely the dictatorship of the working class that ensures the radical replacement of the exploiter state machine with new organs of power that are entirely placed in the service of working people's interests. And it is precisely the dictatorship of the working class--as various strata of society switch to socialist positions and sociopolitical and ideological unity emerge--that creates the preconditions for transforming proletarian statehood and democracy into statehood and democracy of the whole people.

The discovery of the need for a transitional period between the old society and the new and the definition of the class nature of the state corresponding to this period was in itself an outstanding scientific achievement. However, Marx goes even further and provides a much longer-term social forecast. In

Lenin's words, he applies the theory of development to the future society too on the grounds that it /originates/ out of capitalism and is the result of the actions of a social force that is /brought into being/ by capitalism. "In Marx," Lenin emphasizes, "there is no shadow of attempts to make up a utopia, to emptily conjecture about what cannot be known. Marx raises the question of communism just as a naturalist would raise the question of the development of a new biological species, say, once we know that it has arisen in such and such a way and is evolving in such and such a particular direction" ("Complete Collected Works," vol 33, p 85).

His scientific penetration of the essence of the social system that replaces capitalism and for the first time grants everyone the real opportunity to rise from being an isolated "private individual" to being a full member of society enabled Marx, across the decades, to correctly determine a number of the generally significant features of that social system. Here are some of them:

- the transformation of the means of labor into an asset of all society;
- the direct incorporation of individual labor in aggregate collective labor and the direct recognition of it by society;
- the collective appropriation of the global social product;
- the permanent retention in society's hands and nonsubjection to individual distribution of the portion of the product produced necessary for the replacement of worn-out and expended means of production and for the expansion of production, and also for the creation of a reserve or insurance fund;
- the allocation out of that portion of the product used for consumer needs of management expenses and of social funds intended for the joint satisfaction of needs (education, public health, municipal and consumer services, and others), for the maintenance of people not capable of working, and so forth; since Marx practice has also shown the need for certain expenditure to ensure the reliable defense of socialism from imperialist aggression and from attempts to export counterrevolution;
- distribution according to labor, in relations to the quantity and quality of labor;
- the retention in individual distribution of the same principle applied in the exchange of commodity equivalents: a certain quantity of labor in one form is exchanged for a similar quantity of labor in another;
- the remaining in force of inequality between individual people's abilities, their skill, individual labor productivity, and so forth, and also of a certain inequality in material prosperity. Under socialism this "unequal right for unequal labor" plays a positive role since society as yet possesses relatively limited production forces and consumer resources and is forced to vigorously shape the new attitude toward labor and social ownership by employing various levers for both moral and material incentives.

In considering the question of the preconditions under which this law ceases to be necessary, Marx establishes the need for a first and a second phase of the communist formation and offers a detailed description of communism. "During the supreme phase of the communist society," he writes, "after man's enslaving subordination to the division of labor disappears; when the opposition between intellectual and physical labor has disappeared with this; when labor has ceased to be merely a means of living and has become the prime necessity of life; when, along with the all-around development of individuals, production forces have increased and all sources of social wealth are in full flow, only then will it be possible to completely overcome the narrow horizon of bourgeois law and only then will society be able to inscribe on its banner: From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs!" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 19, p 20).

This classic argument of the great teacher of the proletariat forms the foundation of the definition of communism given in the CPSU program. The social reality of the 20th century graphically demonstrates how right Marx was.

In his time Lenin subjected to crushing criticism the bourgeois methods of "refuting" Marxism, which consist of drowning the political and economic essence of the matter in a mass of partial details and farfetched "clarifications." The efforts of the newfound vulgarizers and eclectics, who have vainly contended that Marx' prediction of the future "is not being realized" because its initial premise--large-scale mechanized industry--is now experiencing a different phase of development from that it experienced in the latter half of the 19th century, tend in the same direction. It should not be forgotten, however, that the evolution of industry from the factory and plant production of Marx' times to the conveyor belt-flow line and then partially automated stages, just like the scientific and technical revolution that is now developing, are predicted in one way or another in the works of the founder of scientific communism. Only incompetence or else prejudice made it possible to see in these processes some kind of "counterweight" to the economic law of the movement of modern society--to the increasingly rapid and multifaceted progress of the socialization of labor, which Lenin, after Marx, called the main material foundation of the inevitable coming of socialism (see "Complete Collected Works," vol 26, p 73).

The onslaughts on Marx' forecast of the essential features of the new society have sometimes been justified with the claim that this forecast recognizes socialism only as having a united, all-people (state) form of social ownership and does not take into account the possibility of the emergence of another form of social ownership--the cooperative-group form. But that is not true. For instance, in his famous "Critique of the Gotha Program" Marx expresses a positive attitude toward the worker cooperative associations of his time, since these testified to working people's struggle for a revolution in bourgeois conditions of production. "Marx and I never doubted that during the transition to the full communist economy we would have to employ cooperative production on a large scale as an intermediate link," Engels wrote A. Bebel in January 1886. "But things must be organized in such a way that society--and therefore initially the state--retains ownership of the means of production, and thus the special interests of the cooperative association cannot prevail over the interests of all society as a whole" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 26, p 361).

People have also tried to revise Marx' idea of socialism, citing his well known remark that the law in the new society does not recognize any class differences, because each person is just a worker, like everyone else (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 19, p 19). In the process they have pointed to the supposed incompatibility of what Marx said with the existence under socialism of two classes—the working class and the cooperativized peasantry—and also a social stratum: the intelligentsia. However, here we are dealing by no means with the "vulnerability" of Marx' position, but with the fact that the new system, like any other, can be analyzed in both its more developed and its less developed conditions. Incidentally, both right-wing and "leftwing" revisionists base many of their speculations on precisely this possibility.

Marx often considered socialism that had attained "finished forms," "complete socialism" (Lenin), and he had every grounds for doing so. He approached matters quite differently when he examined in many of his works particular problems of the formation of the new society. It was this difference that Lenin had in mind when he warned of the danger of "getting lost" in the particular zigzags and twists of history at the beginning of socialist building. It is important, Lenin said, "To retrain a general perspective in order to perceive the threat linking all the development of capitalism and the whole road to socialism, a threat which we, of course, see as straight, and we must see it as straight in order to perceive the beginning, the middle, and the end--in life it will never be straight, it will be incredibly complex..." ("Complete Collected Works," vol 36, p 47). The theoretical outline of socialism presented by Marx, for instance, in "Capital" and "Critique of the Gotha Program," has always played and will continue to play an irreplaceable, exceptional role in resolving the tasks of this "straight," long-term orientation of the party, the working class, and the working people's masses according to the deep laws of historical development and the general principles of socialist and communist building.

Current methods of bourgeois criticism of scientific communism and the tendentious comparison of Marx' theoretical propositions with real socialism and attempts to contrast Marx' forecast with the theory and practice of Leninism. Thus, the well-known anticommunist (F. Feyto), in his book "Lenin's Legacy. An Introduction to the History of World Communism," claimed in forthright terms that the Bolsheviks broke with the "original Marxist model of development...." The strange "researches" aimed at "proving" that after October Lenin created a "different model" of socialism from that of Marx went in a similar direction. Whatever the authors of such erroneous concepts might cite, practice has resolutely disproved them.

In his work "State and Revolution" Lenin wrote of the "Critique of the Gotha Program," which set forth most fully Marx' ideas about socialism, that its polemical part initially overshadowed its positive content, so to speak. In our day socialist reality itself prevents this content from being overshadowed. /Marx' work--and the further we advance the more this is so--is surprisingly modern in the main thing--in the way its conclusions accord with the manifest outlines of the society effecting the gradual transition to communism./ Above all, the improvement of production relations of comradely cooperation

and mutual aid is continuing in our country at an accelerated pace. It is manifested in the further concentration of socialist industry, the creation of production of science and production associations, in progressing interfarm cooperation in the countryside, and in agroindustrial integration. It is a case of resolving not only current organizational and economic tasks but also the main problem--the further rapprochement of state and kolkhoz and cooperative ownership. In other words, of approaching the very level of economic socialization of the means of production of which Marx wrote.

A no less characteristic feature connected with the successful erasure of the substantial differences between city and countryside and between physical and mental labor is the new, qualitatively higher, rallying of socialist society, in which a leading role is played by the working class, around the Communist Party and the formation of a new historical community of people--the Soviet people. General features of the behavior, character, and world outlook of Soviet people have begun to emerge actively--features which do not depend on social and national differences--and the alliance of the working class and peasantry, which has always formed the basis of the socialist system, has been continued in the close ideological and political unity of these classes and the intelligentsia, which has long confidently been standing on positions of socialism. The firm alliance of all working people, of working people engaged in physical and mental labor, the alliance of the working class, kolkhoz peasantry, and people's intelligentsia have become a real fact of socialist reality.

For over a century the communists of the world have had the "Critique of the Gotha Program"--that charter of scientific communism outlining in generalized form, without exaggeration, virtually all the main special aims of our movement. To this day it leaves no one indifferent. Some people interpret this work as an imposing socioeconomic project, implemented through the efforts of many peoples, for man's future communal life--a project which creates on the basis of scientific principles the optimum conditions for developing a free individual. Others, conversely, see in it a reflection of a menacing alternative to their petit bourgeois prosperity, to private ownership, exploiter systems, and display selfish interest in instilling in as many people as possible a distorted opinion of Marx' legacy as a literary relic belonging to the past. The class-based ideological struggle over his ideas is now perhaps more acute than when they appeared.

Sometimes the opinion could be heard that Marx and Engels conceived communism as a system "identically" organized in both phases of its development. But that opinion is the fruit of a misunderstanding. How is it possible to term identical the organization of production permitting cooperative farms alongside state farms and an organization based only on the ownership of the means of production by the entire people; the organization of economic life resting on distribution according to labor and thereby presupposing the need to control the degree of labor and the degree of consumption, and an organization which carries out distribution according to need and which has ceased to need such control; a state organization (under socialism) and a stateless self-governing organization (if the threat of the outside restoration of capitalism has been eliminated), as should be the case under communism?

The transition from the former organization to the latter has among its material production prerequisites a multiple increase in the intellectual, creative content of the labor of the main production personnel. At the same time it is impossible without securing during the development of large-scale industry a situation where "the creation of real wealth becomes dependent less on worktime and on the quantity of labor expended than on the power of the agents set in motion during worktime, which themselves in turn (their powerful effectiveness) in no way correspond with the direct worktime required for their production but depend rather on the overall level of science, on the progress of technology, or on the application of this science to production" (K. Marx and F. Engels. "Works," vol 46, part II, p 213).

The myth of the allegedly identical organization of socialism and communism is totally dispelled when you examine the problem of social equality. It is well known that socialism is an as yet imperfect communist society "which /is obliged/ initially to destroy /only/ the 'injustice' that the means of production have been seized by individual people and which /cannot/ immediately destroy the further injustice that is the distribution of consumer goods 'according to work' (and not need)" (V. I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," vol 33, p 93). "Thus," Lenin writes, "in the first phase of the communist society (which is usually called socialism) 'bourgeois law' is repealed /not/ in full but only partially, only to the extent of the economic revolution already achieved, that is, only with respect to the means of production" (ibidem, p 94). Of course, this "extent" does not remain unchanged. The consolidation of socialism and the formation of communist social relations inevitably mean that its limits become increasingly broad. The historically qualitative leap prepared by all previous development will ultimately lead also to the repeal of the above-mentioned legal regulators with respect to consumer goods as well. That is just another expression of the transition to communism, which, if only by virtue of the above-mentioned change, should be organized in a substantially different way from socialism.

Whichever of the qualitative features separating socialism and communism we take, the matter also hinges on man's qualities, on the ideological, cultural, and moral level of the masses, which, /as the level of precisely the masses,/ plays the role of an objective factor of our development. The way in which the material preconditions of communism that man creates will "work" depends on the degree to which he is oriented toward communist progress. The formation of the new man who has mastered the scientific, Marxist-Leninist world outlook and the skills of managing public affairs, who has a high standard of general and professional culture, a developed need for creative labor, and the ability to make sensible use of the boons of socialism is a task which will take many years. Its solution by different generations of builders of the new society has its own features and specific traits, but there is one demand of the era, originating in Marx' third thesis on Feuerbach, which is effective for all: /The individual has increasingly few grounds for considering himself a passive product of circumstances, and his development can be understood rationally only in the light of revolutionary practice--as the coincidence of the change of circumstances and vigorous human activity./

Socialism as the first phase of communism is, according to Marx and Engels, the beginning of the peoples' truly collective life as opposed to the "surrogates of collectivity," the illusory commonality with which people were satisfied under the conditions of the private ownership system. The following serve as objective grounds for this:

--equipment, technology, and the organization of modern mechanized production, which predetermine the need for the joint labor of large masses of people, its continuity, and its intensive rhythm;

--the collective social appropriation of the means, objects, and products of labor, and the determination of each worker's share of the sum of material and spiritual boons in direct relationship to the dimension and quality of his personal labor contribution;

--the practical implementation of the principles of the socialist way of life primarily by the entire working class--the concerned, mass bearer of collectivist principles, labor morality, and the spirit of collective cooperation.

Of course, socialist society has not yet been fully rid of individualist, petit bourgeois vestiges--they sometimes make themselves felt quite markedly. How, that does not alter the essence of socialism as a genuinely collectivist system that enshrines this essential [sushchestvennoye] feature it possesses in the entire system of social relations and institutions, type of culture, and moral and legal norms.

While focusing attention on the economic signs of socialism, as the initial and basic signs, the CPSU by no means considers it possible to restrict itself only to them. A developed social system, Marx taught, can in no way be judged in a more or less exhaustive way by relying on just one factor, however important in itself, and it cannot be so judged precisely because it is a system. It is also essential to analyze the other conditions of maturity of the new system in addition to the economic ones. But we should resolutely oppose a portrayal of them that is not ordered from the viewpoint of materialist determinism, and we should oppose manifestations of prejudice based on personal taste [vkusovshchina] and subjectivism in identifying and describing them.

The path which Marx indicated in speaking of the formation of any new social system now seems most fruitful to Soviet scientists and at the same time one which requires great additional searches. "If in the finished bourgeois system every economic relationship presupposes another in a bourgeois-economic form and every premise is thus at the same time also a precondition, then this occurs in any...organic system. This organic system itself as an integral whole has its own preconditions, and its development in the direction of wholeness consists precisely in subordinating all elements of society to itself or creating from society the organs it still lacks. In the course of historical development the system thus becomes a whole. The transformation of the system into this whole forms an element of the process and development of the system" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 46, p 1, p 229).

In the social system of socialism, which develops into a whole whose nucleus is the socialized economy, a natural mutual correspondence makes itself felt increasingly between its parts and elements and is gradually extended to a wide range of production relations (technical and technological, organizational and managerial, and economic) and in general to the entire ensemble of social relations: production, sociopolitical, moral and legal, material, and ideological. /It is precisely the stage of transformation of our system into a whole which is the stage of developed socialism./ And the more consistently and fully the principles of socialism are implemented in all spheres of social life, the more consistently and fully all elements of the way of life of society are restructured on the basis of its inherent collectivist principles.

The process of socialism's transformation into a whole generates an urgent demand that the resolution of any theoretical and practical tasks be approached comprehensively, taking into account all the conditions that are in any way significant, that the organic supplementing of economic planning with social planning be persistently ensured, that the educational, moral, and political consequences of administrative decisions be foreseen, and that we proceed increasingly persistently from an orientation toward the human factor in all spheres of production and culture.

The development of socialism is accompanied by the constant revelation and buildup of its advantages over the private ownership system. It is natural and essential that the peoples of the socialist countries should desire to outstrip capitalism in terms of all basic indicators relating to economic and cultural level, and the successes achieved in these fields are obvious: the rapid, steady pace of long-term economic growth, stable employment, the systematic, steady improvement of the people's welfare, the masses' unimpeded access to spiritual values, and the guarantees of the rights and freedoms of the individual, which are most fully reflected in the new USSR Constitution. Even with what is as yet a comparatively smaller production potential, the socialist system, in the complex of its material and spiritual boons, social potential and prospects, can give the working people more than capitalism. At the same time, the buildup of the quantitative results and rivalry in improving the quality of consumer goods should not obscure the main thing--a meaningful description of the prevailing socialist way of life and its sociopsychological climate, and a synthesized idea of man's working and daily living conditions, his internal world and relationships with other people, which (conditions) under capitalism give rise to depressive pessimistic trends but under socialism, on the contrary, nurture social optimums.

Let us turn, for example, to the fact of the elimination of exploitation of man by man in the socialist countries. There is no doubt as to its enormous beneficial influence on the formation of the creative and moral character of the citizens of the new world. After all, they do not know the constantly oppressive and psychologically warping feeling produced by economic, political, and national oppression and discrimination--inevitable components of the masses' daily existence in the exploiter society.

No one has the right to keep quiet about the fact that the price which the comparatively affluent strata of working people in the industrially highly developed capitalist countries have to pay for the material sufficiency they have achieved can be expressed only partially in monetary units; to this price should be added /the social stress and chronic sociocultural underconsumption/ which cannot be defined quantitatively. It is in this broad comparison, the only correct one, of the two systems that socialism demonstrates (and with the passage of time will increasingly demonstrate) its undisputed advantages.

In the most abstract form any human community--be it an entire society, generation, nation, or class--has on the one hand a /production/ capability, that is, a certain aggregate of means and objects of labor, skills and abilities, energy capacities, and so forth, and on the other a historically conditioned /consumer/ capability. A characteristic feature of the exploiter, class-antagonistic society is the opposition of these capabilities to each other, the assignment of production duties mainly to the unpropertied and the assignment of opportunities for enjoying consumer benefits mostly to the owners of the means of production. A yardstick of needs is thus established which dictates to the oppressed class norms and forms of consumption defined by the interests of the exploiters, initially primitive ascetic norms, then norms programmed by ubiquitous advertising, while the ruling class is given unlimited scope for luxury and refinement in ever new types of enjoyment.

Socialism as the social system of working people abolishes this contradiction because it destroys exploitation in general. But that does not mean that the problem of needs ceases to be an urgent one. On the contrary, it is precisely new that everyone acquires the opportunity to satisfy these needs to the extent of the potential of social production and of his personal creative contribution to the overall labor of his association. This contribution now wholly determines personal prosperity and dignity, and here once again there comes into operation Marx' principle of the wholeness of the organic social system, because all social phenomena and processes must ultimately be interconnected and intercoordinated.

In the new society /the law of the elevation of needs/ discovered by Lenin (see "Complete Collected Works," vol 1, p 101)--under which, as sensibly understood necessary "needs of existence" are met, there is a relative expansion in the spectrum of spiritual, sociocultural, and creative needs--gains full scope, and the action of this law ultimately produces a situation where the prime need of the individual becomes the need for meaningful, socially useful labor. And that means that for the new man labor acquires the social nature of /a consumer value./ One of Marx' most important discoveries is thus confirmed.

Under our conditions the copying of the scheme of development of needs typical of the capitalist society and the borrowing of bourgeois consumer standards, which deform the moral nature of individual people who live under socialism but lead a nonsocialist way of life, look utterly unacceptable. "We have great material and spiritual opportunities for the increasingly full development of the individual and we will continue to build them up," the 26th CPSU Congress said. "But at the same time it is important that every person

know how to use them sensibly. And this ultimately depends on the individual's interests and needs. That is why our party sees one of the main tasks of social policy as being the active, purposeful formation of these interests and needs."

Our class opponents are trying to transform the great historical challenge in the struggle for man which socialism has issued to the capitalist world into the small change of narrow consumer interests and "values." Socialist society is naturally paying increasing attention to the task of satisfying the Soviet people's constantly growing material requirements, but it conceives the field of competition between the two systems in far broader, wider terms.

It will be appropriate to recall here statements by the remarkable Soviet pedagogue A. S. Makarenko, who believed that the most important things we have come to prize in man--strength and beauty--are determined exclusively by what type of attitude he has toward the long-term prospect. For instance, it may be a case of the simplest satisfaction of an immediate need--upper, visiting a movie, buying new clothes. This is also a prospect, but a most immediate one, and a man who determines his behavior entirely by it is very weak. "If he is satisfied merely with his own prospect, even if it is a long-term one, he may seem strong, but he does not make us feel the beauty of his personality and its real value," the pedagogue writes. "The broader the collective whose prospects are for a person his own personal prospects," he concluded, "then the more beautiful and exalted the person is." (A. S. Makarenko, Pedagogical Works, Moscow-Leningrad, 1948, p 179).

One of the most graphic achievements of the new society is Soviet people's inherent sense that there is an indestructible link between their personal prospects and the prospects of their fatherland, the socialist community, the cause of the peoples' social and national liberation, and the progress of all mankind. That is the active life stance which elevates the individual, the stance whose development the 25th CPSU Congress defined as a task of moral education. This stance is stable only on the basis of a scientific Marxist-Leninist world outlook and internationalist convictions rooted in our socialist existence.

"Educating man means forming long-term paths in him," A. S. Makarenko asserted (*ibidem*). This "philosopher's stone" of the optimistic interpretation of life was found by scientific communism and tested by the socialist system. Any-one who studies Marx' legacy conscientiously rapidly masters it. Capitalist society, where the individual is enclosed in the shell of individualist interests, cannot give man anything like that. It is a society in which the overall crisis of the private ownership system is expressed, in addition to all the rest, in the loss of social and national goals, in the pathology of the lack of a future. Where a person who does not belong to the exploiter class, whatever he may achieve personally in his life, is persistently dogged by the shadow of uncertainty for the future.

The collective whose immediate and long-term prospects were for Marx personal prospects is called /mankind./ But he did not treat this collective in an

abstract way, with the all-consuming and all-forgiving love which is sometimes made out to be humanism. Marx /as a man of the party/ singled out in mankind its progressive section, the precious concentrate of humanity which alone can spare the human race from social and national enslavement--the struggling revolutionary proletariat. Without an understanding of this truth it is impossible to understand why he defined communism as real humanism.

Marx, with whom Engels and Lenin must be studied indivisibly, is for us the main educator in long-term paths. Firmly standing on the real soil of the present day, he was turned entirely toward the future and dreamed of it, lived for it, and struggled for it. "I congratulate you..." he wrote to his daughter Jenny on learning of the birth of his grandson on 29 April 1881. "The 'female half' of our family hoped that 'the newcomer' would increase the 'better half' of the human race; for my part I prefer the 'man's' sex for children born at this turning point of history. We have before us the most revolutionary period man has ever lived through. It is a bad thing to be 'an old man' now and to be able only to foresee instead of seeing for yourself" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 35, p 153).

Marx knew that he would not live to see the beginning of the new, communist, socioeconomic formation whose advent he had predicted. His lifetime was separated from it by a number of decades. But Marx' prediction was of the highest quality. It does not cede to authentic scientific observation of the accomplished fact, and it continues to work successfully and tirelessly for his successors and the revolution.

CSO: 1802/13

PARTY DECISION AND ITS EFFICACY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 43-53

[Article by I. Bondarenko, Rostov CPSU Obkom first secretary]

[Text] Party decisions! These are documents of deep meaning and lofty purpose. They enjoy the tremendous respect of the party members and all working people. The resolutions of party congresses and CPSU Central Committee decrees formulate the party's scientific policy and indicate the ways and means for reaching stipulated levels. As was noted at the 25th CPSU Congress, they concentrate the collective will and experience of the masses and provide the party organizations with efficient guidelines and clear directives.

The party decisions are the most important prerequisite and basic method for enhancing the work level not only of party but soviet and economic organs and mass public organizations. They unite and rally party and nonparty members and help to strengthen unity between the party and the people.

The party committees and primary party organizations have no concern higher than that of implementing party decrees and instructions. Mastered by the masses, the CPSU decisions become a powerful material force. They become effective, for which reason they fire up the hearts of millions of people, calling them to new accomplishments for the sake of the blossoming of the homeland and the happiness and well-being of the people.

The leading and guiding influence of the Leninist party in all realms of sociopolitical life is growing steadily. Its prestige among the masses is exceptionally high. It is strengthened by the specific accomplishments of the CPSU and the real contribution which its organizations make to the nationwide cause of building communism. The party expresses the ripe problems of social development and organizes their practical solution. It is concerned with the systematic implementation of socialist principles, supports everything new and progressive and fights alien phenomena and facts.

The 2 years which have passed since the 26th CPSU Congress prove that the working people of the Don town and country have adopted its resolutions as their own. Like all Soviet people, they entirely and fully support the political course formulated by the party and work with dedication on the implementation of the 11th Five-Year Plan. Objectively assessing accomplishments in Rostov Oblast within that period, we can note with satisfaction that these were years of further growth. We have taken yet another

step forward. Industrial output has increased and commodities worth 140 million rubles were marketed above the plan. Most important target projects have been commissioned. They include capacities at the Novocherkassk Electric Locomotive Engines and Rostsel'mash. More than 60,000 new comfortable apartments were built and the pace of construction in the countryside has intensified. The production of 1 million tons of corn grain was reached for the first time in 1982. The 2-year plans for vegetable and melon crops and eggs were fulfilled. Some successes have been achieved in the development of transportation and services and other economic sectors.

These achievements are the result of the dedicated efforts of the Don working class, kolkhoz peasant and people's intelligentsia and the purposeful and persistent activities of party committees and organizations in improving the ways and methods of party management in industrial and agricultural production and all organizational, political and ideological-educational work among the masses.

Guided by the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the May and November 1982 Central Committee plenums, the Rostov Oblast party committee is steadily keeping track of the main problems of the oblast's socioeconomic development. The Don party members clearly realize their high responsibility to the party and CPSU Central Committee for resolving major problems of great importance to the national economy of the entire country. This five-year plan we must complete the construction of the second part of the Atommash Plant, commission the first power unit at the Rostov Nuclear Electric Power Plant, develop and organize the series production of new highly efficient grain harvesters of the "Don" series, reconstruct the Novocherkassk Electric Locomotive Engines Plant, reaching an output of 500 main-line electric locomotive engines annually, and commission the metallurgical plant in Krasnyy Sulin, which will have an annual production capacity of 100,000 tons of iron powder.

The successful implementation of the Food Program is presently the daily concern of the entire oblast party organization. These problems become particularly important in light of the stipulations and conclusions expressed in the presentation by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, at the April Conference of First Secretaries of Central Committees of Communist Parties of Union Republics and Party Kraykoms and Obkoms.

The Rostov CPSU Obkom is directing the efforts of city and rayon committees and primary party organizations toward improving economic management and activities of labor collectives, perfecting work style and methods, implementing effective measures for the further development of the socialist competition under the slogan "Work Without Laggards," concentrating capital investments on target complexes and projects and mastering ahead of schedule new and ensuring the fullest possible utilization of existing production capacities. The rural party organizations are encouraging the further intensification of agricultural production, the strengthening of its material and technical base and increasing output and its sale to the state.

Whenever necessary, the CPSU obkom, gorkoms and raykoms and the primary party organizations pass one resolution or decree or another in the course of implementing their assignments, with a view to accelerating economic and social

development, enhancing the level and efficiency of organizational-party work and further strengthening party, state and labor discipline.

The majority of Don party committees and organizations thoughtfully approach the process of preparations for and making of decisions and define the tasks and the means and methods for their implementation. They are guided by the stipulation formulated in the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Further Improving Control and Supervision of Execution in Light of the Resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress." Party decisions, the decree stipulates, "must be formulated on the basis of the comprehensive and profound study of reality and party practical work; they must take into consideration the views and proposals of party and nonparty members and working peoples' letters. They must be based on progressive undertakings and initiatives generated by party organizations and labor collectives."

Strictly in accordance with this stipulation, we have formulated a procedure which defines deadlines for drafting decrees and their number, as well as basic stipulations relative to their content. For example, the fact that draft decrees must contain a profound study of the circumstances and socio-economic data, reflect the achievements of science, technical progress and progressive experience, and take into consideration both positive and negative phenomena and facts has become an inviolable rule. In a word, we are trying to make the decrees consistent with the party's political line and CPSU bylaw stipulations; we try to make them relevant, comprehensive and contributive to the solution of central problems of intraparty life and party management of economic and cultural construction.

Great attention is paid to the scientific substantiation of resolutions. This means that a document issued by a party committee must take into consideration the objective laws governing the development of party and society. It must be based on reliable and sufficiently complete information. It must earmark realistic objectives and efficient practical means to achieve them. A resolution is profound, comprehensively substantiated and effective if it takes into consideration ripe problems and public opinion and defines the tasks of a city, rayon or collective.

The efficacy of a party decision largely depends precisely on the specific nature of stipulated measures. It must constitute a real program for practical action and answer the questions of who, what, when and where and what means must be invested to ensure its implementation? Wherever this is neglected, decrees assume a general nature of statements and leave no noticeable mark in the life of the party organizations. As a rule, such decrees deal with insignificant matters. They are written loosely. They formulate no new demands. They do not indicate efficient ways and means for improving matters and eliminating shortcomings and blunders. Such documents abound in cliches such as "pay attention," "upgrade responsibility," "increase the work," "demand," "instruct," and so on. They teach nothing and obligate no one, which makes them unviable.

The reason we are mentioning shortcomings in decision-making is not because they are commonplace. On the contrary, such omissions are atypical and un-

characteristic of party committees and organizations in the oblast. However, if we are truly willing to eliminate them faster, we must strictly obey the stipulation of the CPSU Central Committee to the effect that "each draft decree must contain efficient stipulations and tasks, indicate the means and methods for their implementation and stipulate specific deadlines and individuals responsible for their implementation."

In our view, in order for a decree to be viable and define means for the solution of ripe problems, it must be comprehensive. This means that it must include a system of interrelated and interdependent organizational and educational measures (rather than an enumeration of unrelated measures), which will ensure reaching the set targets and unity between political and organizational activities, decisions and implementations, and words and actions.

In V. I. Lenin's words, the comprehensive approach enables us "to find at each specific moment the special link in the chain, which we must grab with all our strength if we are to hold the entire chain" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 205), to establish the interconnection between the solution of immediate and long-term problems, and to define the place and responsibility of party, trade union and Komsomol organizations, soviet and economic organs and labor collectives in the implementation of assignments.

The long years of practice of the Rostov Oblast party organization also proves that the efficacy of a party document starts in the course of the study and summation of factual data and remarks and suggestions submitted by party and nonparty members. In drafting resolutions, the CPSU Obkom and many Don party committees take into consideration the recommendations of scientific and practical science conferences. They use statistical data, results of sociological studies and surveys and official information reported by organizations and establishments. No serious and thorough document can be drafted without them.

In other words, the power and efficacy of a party decision are established in the course of its preparation and prior to its adoption and practical implementation. Unquestionably, the more profoundly the drafted document penetrates reality and more completely takes into consideration processes and phenomena in real life in their variety and interconnection and the features of party organizations and labor collectives and the tasks they face, the greater the degree of its influence and its practical results becomes.

The following is an example of the extensive and painstaking work which determines decision-making. The question of improving the quality of output, discussed at the obkom plenum, and the corresponding resolution which was passed were preceded by extensive preparations which were carried out gradually, on the basis of a plan drafted by the various obkom departments with the help of specialists. Senior obkom personnel, party activists, scientific associates, specialists in many economic sectors, labor veterans, production frontrakers and innovators, members of soviet and economic organs and representatives of trade unions and other public organizations were made commission members and drawn into the organization and implementation of the

various measures. At enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhozes they studied the means and methods of work aimed at ensuring high production quality and the practical utilization of scientific achievements.

On the basis of the commission's recommendations, unannounced inspections were made by worker and rural correspondents and people's controllers to check on the observance of technological requirements and standards at the workplace and the extent to which the new progressive technological processes proposed by rationalizers and innovators and aimed at upgrading production quality were being applied. Wherever omissions and shortcomings were noted the commission members made a detailed study of their reasons and helped local managers and specialists to formulate specific measures aimed at the elimination of bottlenecks.

The commission's proposals and remarks became the base of the draft report and decree. Their preliminary discussion by the party obkom bureau made possible a critical view on the results of the work and an assessment of the actual situation regarding production quality and the level of party and economic management of this important sector and the formulation of a collective opinion on the problem, which excluded subjectivistic assessments.

Our own experience proves that the optimal variant of a party decision and efficient measures to upgrade organizational and political work can be defined only by a collective organ. The skilled collective study and discussion of the problem enables us to identify more profoundly positive processes and negative trends which may remain unnoticed in the course of daily work. This, however, is quite important in ensuring the objective and efficient nature of a decision.

As a result, we formulated and passed well-substantiated documents consistent with CPSU Central Committee requirements. We formulated the main line of action of the party obkom, gorkoms and raykoms and oblast soviet and trade union organizations, administrations and departments. The plenum also recommended to party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations and economic managers extensively to develop the socialist competition in labor collectives under the slogan "Excellent Quality Don Output!" and ubiquitously to develop with the help of scientific research and design institutes comprehensive plans for organizational and technical measures to upgrade the quality, reliability and durability of produced items. The task was set of significantly increasing output bearing the state Emblem of Quality. At the same time, the basic ways and means for reaching the targets were formulated.

The plenum instructed the obkom party bureau and oblast executive committee to organize and apply oblast, city and rayon quality control systems. The attention of party committees was drawn on the need to strengthen the role of party members in the struggle for high-quality output and for energizing the work of committees in charge of controlling administrative activities of shop party organizations and party groups, and party organizers and all party members.

Taking local features and possibilities into consideration, the obkom bureau approved a plan for organizational-propaganda measures for the implementation of the plenum's decisions and actions related to the critical remarks and suggestions formulated in the course of the discussions. The main lines of supervision were defined and deadlines were set for gathering efficient information and reports on implementation of the decree. The urban and rural rayon party committees and primary party organizations formulated their specific tasks.

The oblast, city and rayon economic organs, enterprises, organizations, kolkhozes and sovkhozes actively joined the common project. The measures they formulated were discussed at production conferences and worker and kolkhoz member meetings. The same problems were considered at sessions of city and rayon soviets of people's deputies.

Considerable work to upgrade production quality was carried out following the adoption of the CPSU obkom plenum decree. The oblast is currently completing the organization of a territorial system for production quality control. Quality houses and offices have been opened in most cities and rayons, sponsoring permanent exhibitions. Some 500 Don industrial enterprises have introduced comprehensive quality control systems.

In accordance with the comprehensive oblast plan for upgrading the technical standards and quality of output in 1981-1985, last year alone the oblast enterprises formulated and applied more than 2,400 most important measures to upgrade quality, which resulted in saving some 23 million rubles.

Together with other social organizations, the North Caucasian Standardization and Metrology Center sponsored some 40 conferences, seminars and progressive experience courses for enterprise and organization specialists, attended by more than 4,500 people. A public review was also held for the best organization of the work for metrological production support, aimed at achieving high efficacy and enhancing technical standards and quality of output. Some 140 associations, enterprises and organizations participated. More than 1,500 proposals to improve metrological support of technological processes, quality control and use of new methods for checking measuring instruments were submitted in the course of the review and made possible the conventional release of more than 1,000 workers.

The party gorkoms and raykoms have worked a great deal to promote socialist competition among labor collectives under the slogans "Quality Guarantee From Design to Item," "State Emblem of Quality for Each New Item," and "Maximal Output of Superior Category Goods." Extensive work is being done also to upgrade the quality of delivered construction projects, crop growing and animal husbandry products and population services.

This has led to substantial changes. Whereas at the beginning of the 10th Five-Year Plan the share of industrial output bearing the state Emblem of Quality accounted for 3.7 percent of the overall output, today it has reached 13.4 percent and accounts for more than 30 percent of the entire output subject to certification. The number of projects delivered by construction

workers with an "excellent" or "good" rating has increased. In the past, the amount of first-grade milk delivered at the reception centers did not exceed 42-43 percent; the current indicator is close to 80 percent. Deliveries of fruits and vegetables to the state have increased considerably as well. Naturally, unresolved problems remain. As a whole, however, a substantial positive change is obvious.

Therefore, a timely decree, purposeful implementation steps and systematic control of execution have efficiently helped party committees, primary party organizations, economic organs and town and country working people to eliminate omissions and shortcomings in their work and to take steps to upgrade production quality.

The precise consideration of all factors ensuring its viability is a necessary prerequisite in the formulation of a decision. It is important to point out in this connection that our decisions on major problems of oblast economic development are greatly enriched as a result of the active participation in their formulation of interested union and republic ministries and departments with which we are in constant touch. For example, in order to ensure the successful reconstruction of Don combine manufacturing plants, together with the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building and USSR Ministry of Construction of Heavy Industry Enterprises, the oblast party committee drafted measures on the basis of which a joint resolution was passed on a specific program for coordinated actions aimed at increasing the production of combines and improving their productivity and quality.

The party obkom bureau, oblast executive committee and collegium of the USSR Ministry of Communications passed decrees in 1980-1981 on the development of communications facilities in the oblast between 1981 and 1985. At that time documents were jointly drafted and passed with a number of ministries on problems related to light and textile industry enterprises, the consumer cooperative, state trade, public catering and consumer services.

Our oblast has a well-developed food industry which numbers more than 170 enterprises employing tens of thousands of people. Its marketable output was worth 1.4 billion rubles in 1982. The oblast party committee and executive committee pay continuing attention to the development of sectors directly related to the implementation of the Food Program. Efficient programs for the development of such industrial sectors during the 11th Five-Year Plan have been drafted together with the RSFSR ministries of food and meat and dairy industry.

The main target of our efforts is to reach high work effectiveness at enterprises and to help them improve production capacities and expand production variety and improve its quality. Guided by the decisions of the May and November 1982 CPSU Central Committee plenums, we are trying to strengthen the ties between agriculture and the processing industry, ensuring the maximal utilization of field and livestock farm output and reduce losses along the entire chain of the agroindustrial complex.

The most important problem on which we are working on this level is the use of wasteless or low-waste technology at food and processing industry enterprises. The oblast party committee bureau and oblast executive committee passed the decree "On Measures to Organize Wasteless Processing of Agricultural Commodities at Food Industry Sectors in the Oblast in 1981-1985." The decree sets deadlines for the application of wasteless technology and the target is to develop wasteless technology at each food and processing industry enterprise. Some 10 million rubles will be invested in technical measures to install such technology in the course of the five-year plan. The implementation of these measures will enable us to save more than 9 million rubles as a result of the full utilization of secondary raw materials alone.

The party obkom and oblast executive committee and the local party and soviet organs have assumed daily control over the implementation of organizational and technical measures which contribute to the efficient utilization of raw materials and the introduction of wasteless and low-waste technologies. This involves mainly the construction of new shops for manufacturing non-funded goods, the wasteless processing of raw materials, the reconstruction and creation of specialized sectors in operating shops, and the extensive use of local raw material resources in increasing the production of comestible goods.

The party obkom bureau supported the good initiative of the collectives of the Novocherkassk City Dairy Plant and the Shakhty Meat Combine, which adopted as their work slogan "More Output Per Ton of Processed Raw Material." Last year, the RSFSR Council of Ministers approved the initiative of local food industry enterprises in six krays and oblasts, including Rostov, which pledged to overfulfill the 11th Five-Year Plan and ensure above-plan food production through the better utilization of production capacities and use of local raw material resources.

We can say that today wasteless and low-waste technology is being reliably applied at Don enterprises. Thus, the Novocherkassk City Dairy Plant has achieved the 100 percent processing of whey, as a result of which it has increased its output by more than 14,000 tons. Last year alone, the use of wasteless technology saved the plant 450,000 rubles. A technology for the production of powdered food from fruit marcs, the use of which saves a great deal of sugar, flour and other types of raw materials used in making confectionery goods, was applied at the Aksay Food Combine. A great deal is being done to raise the level of comprehensive processing of raw materials in the canning, butterfat, fish and other food industry sectors. Practical experience has proved the economic expediency and moral value of efforts in this direction, for wasteless production teaches people thrift and a concerned attitude toward the people's good.

Although paying great attention to the drafting of party resolutions and improving their quality and efficiency, the CPSU Obkom does not neglect other practically developed and suitably proven methods. For example, scientists from the Don Zonal Scientific Research Agricultural Institute and the All-Russian Scientific Research and Design-Technological Agricultural Mechanization and Electrification Institute participated in the study of the organizational and mass-political work carried out by the oblast party organizations to ensure the highly efficient use of agricultural equipment in

harvesting the crops and drafting the respective decree. A large group of specialists and production innovators and frontrankers participated in drafting the obkom bureau decree on the practical experience of party groups and brigade collectives at the first pipe welding shop of the metallurgical plant in Taganrog in producing above-plan goods from saved metal and power resources.

A skillfully drafted resolution is, in the final account, the foundation on which the party organizations build their organizational and political work, thus ensuring the further development of the economy, science and culture. Following the adoption of a decision the center of gravity shifts precisely to organizational work, to control of execution.

Practical experience has confirmed that a party decision becomes a mobilizing force only if it is immediately taken to the performers, ensuring the concentration of forces on decisive sectors and properly deploying the party members in accordance with stipulated targets. Decrees play a major educational role as well, by upgrading the activeness of party members and their personal responsibility for the common project and the success of the entire collective. They assist in the development of mass initiative.

The implementation of a decision is the main target in organizing implementation efforts by the party apparatus and aktiv. "Having made a decision," the 26th CPSU Congress emphasized, "we must work for its strict implementation within the stipulated time. This, precisely, is the purpose of intensified control. Such control must be provided systematically and efficiently, both from above and below."

Control over the implementation of decisions and supervision of execution are a single process and indivisible aspects of organizational work. As organs of political and organizational management, the party committees must above all, in Lenin's words, "shift the center of gravity from drafting decrees and orders...to the selection of people and supervision of execution" (op. cit., vol 44, pp 368-369). A decree, even a competent one, will remain no more than a pious wish without the efficient organization of its implementation. This is well understood by the party committees and we are always concerned with improving this work in order to make it even more efficient and productive.

In our view, a successful method for increasing the responsibility of cadres for the prompt implementation of decrees issued by party plenums and obkom bureau meetings is, as we mentioned, the formulation by its departments of plans for organizational-propaganda measures. Such plans include four or five basic items which stimulate, on a mandatory basis, where, when and by whom a decree should be discussed and where and when it should be issued.

As a rule, control of execution is assigned to the respective obkom department and, within the department, to a senior official. Such officials must quickly inform the party committees of the content of decisions and the formulated plans for control organization and their practical implementation. They periodically report to the obkom bureau and secretariat on the course of

implementation of decrees and, if necessary, submit proposals on additional measures aimed at resolving formulated problems within a shorter period or on a broader scale.

The quarterly discussion of departmental reports on various activities by the party obkom secretariat substantially contributes to improving control and supervision of execution of party and government directives. The items discussed may include work with cadre reserves, dissemination and application of progressive experience, trade union and Komsomol guidance in the implementation of party decisions and obkom and oblast executive committee decrees, and the practice of drafting resolutions and organizing control of execution. The problems of control and supervision of execution are regularly considered at meetings of the party organization of the party obkom apparatus, at party committee and party bureau departmental meetings and worker conferences.

Unquestionably, the most efficient control method extensively used by us is on-site investigation. It is precisely this that enables us profoundly to determine and understand the actual situation and promptly note and disseminate the new features acquired through practical experience in the course of the implementation of a decree, take into consideration acquired experience, and identify and eliminate shortcomings promptly.

We have developed a specific system for studying the work of party organizations in implementing decrees and informing the party organ on the course of the implementation of stipulated measures. This strengthens the link between the party organ and the primary party units, which enhances performing discipline and the responsibility of party, soviet and economic cadres for the implementation of the document. The ways and methods which have been established in the practical work of the CPSU Obkom in the formulation and adoption of party decisions and control over their execution are yielding positive results.

The Don party organizations have acquired substantial experience in increasing control efficiency and supervision of execution in terms of strengthening planning discipline, which is inseparably tied to the development of the competition for work without laggards. The movement, which was initiated by the oblast's leading industrial enterprises, has become widespread throughout the country and was highly rated by the CPSU Central Committee.

This patriotic initiative developed gradually. Each of its stages was, in turn, a period for the organization of party control over the implementation of decisions aimed at developing the movement and meeting state plans and obligations.

Priority was given to ensuring work without lagging industrial enterprises for the single indicator of production marketing. This was followed by adding to controlled indicators the growth of labor productivity, installation of new equipment and reaching stipulated production variety. This called for energizing the organizational and political activities of all party organizations and the solution of a wide range of ideological and technical and economic problems related to the development of the competition,

the determination of means and methods for the participation of the public in production development strengthening the tie between science and practice. The suggested program of measures was codified in respective decrees promulgated by the party obkom bureau and the established system for party control of the work of lagging enterprises.

Major attention was paid to improving current and efficient planning, strengthening lagging sectors with experienced cadres and enhancing the level of worker training in mass skills. Socialist competition management was improved as well. Its means and methods were directed toward upgrading quality indicators, reaching high production efficiency, extensively applying progressive experience and scientific achievements and publicizing labor rivalry more extensively.

Organizational work was based on increasing the role and militancy of shop and brigade primary party organizations and, above all, increasing control and supervision of execution, improving the placement of party members and strengthening performing discipline. Reports submitted by party members on fulfillment of plans and obligations at party committee and bureau sessions and party meetings were assigned an important role within the party control system. The work of the commissions controlling administrative economic activities was energized significantly.

All of this yielded positive results. There were virtually no lagging enterprises in terms of production marketing and labor productivity in Don industry during the 10th Five-Year Plan. The number of collectives which failed to fulfill their production variety plans and lagging intraproduction subunits dropped sharply. We are continuing to develop and improve the movement for work without laggards in other economic sectors as well during the 11th Five-Year Plan.

The oblast party organization drew the attention to ensuring an even stronger tie between this movement and upgrading production efficiency and work quality and extending this initiative in construction, agriculture, transportation and services, and intraproduction subunits such as shops, sectors, sections and brigades and individual competition for the strict implementation of output norms and obligations. The initiative for reaching planned capacity ahead of schedule, which has developed extensively, is acquiring particular importance.

Good results are obtained through the implementation of measures stipulated in the obkom bureau decree "On Measures To Improve Labor Training and Education and Vocational Guidance of Students in General Educational Schools." The decree was passed several years ago. Within that time the number of labor offices in oblast schools has increased by a factor of 11. Today such offices exist in virtually all 10-grade schools. The fleet of agricultural machinery in secondary agricultural schools has been expanded considerably. Over the past few years they have been supplied with 257 tractors, 195 combines, 72 trucks and more than 1,000 units of other types of agricultural equipment. Two hundred practice areas have been organized on school grounds, where rural students are trained in handling tractors, combines and motor vehicles.

Today more than 60 percent of urban school students undergo labor training in training shops at industrial enterprises. Most school workshops and classrooms and interscholar training-production combines have been updated in accordance with contemporary requirements. The implementation of such measures beneficially affected the vocational guidance and job placing of graduates in material production.

Such examples clearly prove the timeliness of the decrees passed by the CPSU Obkom and the efficacy of the planned measures to resolve most important state tasks. They also prove that the art of leadership consists above all of the skill to concentrate the attention on key directions, on the one hand, and to ensure the efficient implementation of decisions, on the other.

"We must make it a rule," said Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, party Central Committee general secretary, at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "for each new decision on a specific matter to be made only after previous decisions have been implemented or if new circumstances have arisen."

While noting the positive aspects of our work in drafting resolutions and organizing control and supervision of execution, we also bear in mind the existence of omissions in this key sector of activities of the obkom, the CPSU gorkoms and raykoms and the primary party organizations. Some party committees and primary party organizations draft their resolutions hastily, without adequate work and substantiation. Some decisions contain a large number of general statements and reiteration of universally known truths. Cases of cribbing decrees still occur. Instead of ensuring the practical organization of matters, some party committees engage in fussy sessions and in drafting and making large numbers of decisions, while sometimes reducing control merely to gathering reports and information. Such workstyle frequently worsens shortcomings, paralyzes initiative and triggers irresponsibility. The oblast party committee tries to eliminate such shortcomings.

Party control was and remains an inseparable feature of the Leninist style of management and one of the leading principles governing the organizational activities of the party and all its units. The oblast party committee and the local CPSU committees will continue to upgrade the substantiation and the scientific, specific and efficient nature of party decisions, to implement them consistently and persistently and to supervise their execution. The Don party organizations consider this one of the important prerequisites for the successful implementation of the program for building communism formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress and the May and November 1982 party Central Committee plenums.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/13

EFFICIENCY IN PARTY WORK

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 54-63

[Article by V. Dobrik, Lvov Obkom first secretary]

[Text] As an inseparable feature of party management, efficiency determines those among its qualities without which even the most meaningful decision and best plans would be just meaningless sentences hanging in the air. The ability to determine development prospects, to earmark immediate and more distant objectives and to organize matters practically in such a way as to ensure the strict implementation of plans is an absolutely necessary element in party management.

"...It is precisely for the sake of implementing our revolutionary tasks," V. I. Lenin wrote, "precisely so that such tasks may not remain merely utopian or as pious wishes, but truly become reality...precisely for the sake of this objective that we must now set as our next, first and most important task the practicality and efficiency of organizational work" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 159).

The CPSU Central Committee continuously draws attention to the need for a scientific approach to party management, unity of thought and execution, all-round evaluation of acquired experience, profound study and summation of processes in social life and constant investigation of whether our own practice is consistent with changing conditions and new requirements.

We know that the results of our party's comprehensive activities in implementing the resolutions of the 26th Congress are largely determined by the extent to which all of its units operate actively, creatively, purposefully, efficiently and harmoniously. In other words, the implementation of these decisions depends above all on the work of oblast, city and rayon party committees and primary party organizations. The combination of party principle-mindedness and efficiency is a prerequisite for the consistent and successful implementation of the party's political line and its constructive plans and assignments. It is precisely increased efficiency and comprehensive strengthening of discipline and organization that constitute the most important direction in improving the style of party work on the basis of Leninist principles.

"We must," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, said at the November 1982 Central Committee Plenum, "create the type of

economic and organizational conditions which would encourage quality and productive work, initiative and enterprise. Conversely, poor work, idleness and negligence must affect most directly and irreversibly the bonus, official position and moral prestige of the working people."

Lvov Oblast is an area of highly developed industry, agriculture, science and culture. It became such under the Soviet system. From the very first days that the Western Ukrainian oblasts joined the united family of Soviet peoples in 1939, specialists and necessary equipment began arriving here from all corners of our huge country. With the fraternal aid of all Soviet republics, the small artisan workshops developed into a powerful socialist industry. More than 200 large enterprises were built or reconstructed in the oblast in postwar times. Compared with 1940 the volume of industrial output increased by a factor of 68. Today a considerable percentage of the republic's production of a number of commodities is concentrated in the oblast, including 100 percent of all lift trucks and overhead conveyors, 96 percent of all buses, 94 percent of self-propelling cranes, 26 percent of television sets and 23 percent of automation instruments and systems. Transportation, capital construction, trade and consumer and medical population services are developing.

Agriculture has become a highly productive sector specializing in animal husbandry products and industrial, grain and vegetable crops and potatoes. Between 1965 and 1982 the volume of gross agricultural output from the public sector increased by 50 percent.

Naturally, none of this came by itself. It was the result of the daily efforts of party, soviet, trade union and other public organizations, economic organs and labor collectives, i.e., the sum total of components, the main among which was, and remains, competent party leadership.

Our main efforts are directed toward resolving the problem set at the 26th CPSU Congress: completing the conversion of the economy to primarily intensive development. As was pointed out at the congress, in terms of historical scale, significance and consequences, this task may be ranked with a most profound change such as the country's socialist industrialization.

We can justifiably say that intensive development is increasingly making its way in our country. After undertaking the concentration and specialization of small and dispersed enterprises and being among the first in the country to set up cost-effectiveness firms, we took the path of organizing production and scientific-production associations, which now account for two-thirds of the oblast's entire industrial output.

The task of comprehensively accelerating scientific and technical progress, the relevance of which was reemphasized in Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's article "Karl Marx's Doctrine and Some Problems of Socialist Construction in the USSR," is being implemented by our oblast party organization above all on the basis of a practical approach to strengthening the ties between science and production. The UkrSSR Academy of Sciences Western Scientific Center was set up as early as 1971. Today the oblast's scientific institutions, higher educational establishments and design and engineering and other organizations

employ 12,600 scientific and scientific-teaching workers, who include 353 doctors and 4,000 candidates of sciences.

With our large production and substantial scientific potential, we considered the problem of combining their efforts in order to provide a comprehensive solution to problems of production intensification, socioeconomic development of towns and settlements and training highly skilled cadres. In 1976 the obkom party bureau approved a plan for the development of scientific research and aid to scientific and technical progress during the 10th Five-Year Plan. It covered problems of basic research, steps for the practical application of scientific developments, improved ties between scientific research institutes and educational establishments, strengthening their material base and improving the quality of specialist training.

In order to ensure the implementation of scientific and technical target programs, the center created interdepartmental target scientific production and training-scientific production associations. This provided basic science with prospects for directly influencing increased production efficiency. In turn, the collectives of industrial enterprises acquired the even stronger conviction that conversion to intensive development was inconceivable without a connection between production and science and the use of the latter's achievements. Such cooperation enabled us to take a different look at the real state of affairs and reorganize in order to achieve a more efficient approach to the solution of most important economic problems. The result was that during the 10th Five-Year Plan we put to use 200 scientific and technical developments the economic results of which exceeded 153 million rubles. The number of applied developments nearly tripled and duration time from idea to practical implementation declined by one-half.

Specific examples prove the results of cooperation for both scientific institutions and industrial enterprises. Thus, in 1971 the UkrSSR Academy of Sciences Physics-Mechanical Institute worked on five contract projects for industry. The number of such developments today has quadrupled, while economic results have quintupled.

In the course of its creative association with scientists, the Drogobych Drilling Bits Plant increased the technical standard of its output and its reliability and durability. During the last five-year plan average drilling per bit produced by the plant increased by 60 percent. Outlays of high-alloy steel per meter of drilling dropped by more than 30 percent.

During the current five-year plan practical cooperation between science and production will yield even better results.

V. I. Lenin pointed out that while engaging in daily affairs we must not lose sight of the future. "...One must be able to combine both; one cannot work," he taught, "without a long-term plan aimed at achieving major success" (op. cit., vol 42, pp 153-154).

In our efforts to implement this thought, together with the scientists we formulated a long-term plan for the acceleration of scientific and technical

progress and are working on the implementation of target programs such as "Energy Complex," "Agrocomplex," "Quality," and others.

As was pointed out at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the efficient use of material and manpower resources is a major reserve in upgrading production efficiency. We are resolving this problem within the framework of the Trud Interdepartmental Scientific Production Association, the activities of which are directed toward the elaboration and implementation of a comprehensive program for the mechanization of manual work and improving manpower use efficiency.

The implementation of this program enabled us to save the labor of some 15,000 people and to reduce the share of workers engaged in manual labor by nearly 2 percent, thus transferring from manual to mechanized work 10,400 workers and kolkhoz members in the basic material production sectors in 1981 alone.

We have begun to apply more energetically a practical approach based on scientific data to the solution of a number of current and long-term problems. Specifically, this applies to the development and utilization of a comprehensive quality control system approved by the CPSU Central Committee. It is self-evident that this work did not begin from scratch. We began with the study of the experience of the leading enterprises in the country, analyzed our own possibilities and reserves and defined means for resolving the problem. A great deal of effort was required to achieve the psychological reorganization of labor collectives and ensure improved production quality without lowering quantitative indicators.

During the last five-year plan the volume of output awarded the state Emblem of Quality quadrupled. Currently 390 oblast enterprises are applying a comprehensive quality control system. Our industrial sectors now produce 1,719 superior-quality items. The share of superior category output in the total volume of goods subject to certification has reached 37 percent.

Problems of expanding the variety and improving the quality of consumer goods are kept under special control by the obkom, party gorkoms and raykoms, primary party organizations and soviet organs. During the 10th Five-Year Plan the oblast produced consumer goods worth more than 10 billion rubles. The volume of output of household and consumer goods increased by 50 percent. What matters is that today all sectorial enterprises of group "A" industry are currently engaged in such work. In 1982 we produced 1.91 rubles' worth of consumer goods per ruble in wages.

Systemic quality control methods enabled the collectives using them systematically to influence factors affecting the technical and economic production characteristics at all stages from design to marketing.

Unquestionably, comprehensive systemic quality control approach has a great future. An automated production control system, covering all management levels, was developed and is being applied on the basis of the development of the current one. Similar systems are already operating in a number of indus-

trial enterprises with their own subsystems, which help us to assess the quality of the labor of workers, engineering and technical personnel, individual sectors and subunits. In the future, the entire set of technical and economic problems will be resolved with the help of computers.

As we know, work indicators in industry and other economic sectors largely depend on transportation. The 26th CPSU Congress set reducing transportation expenditures on the level of a nationwide task. Considerable reduction in such expenditures would increase the economic efficiency of public production.

The work of the Lvov railroad has its special characteristics. It is a frontier line handling a large volume of export-import freight. Furthermore, it hauls a substantial amount of local freight. However, its stationary facilities and spurs are insufficiently developed. Given this situation, half-measures and short-term campaigns could not substantially improve matters. Regardless of the number of organizational and technical measures we formulated and all the projects we undertook, we were able to resolve the problem radically only thanks to the application of a comprehensive system for the efficient use of freight cars, which enabled us to combine the efforts of transportation workers and enterprise collectives in sharply reducing rolling stock idling. To this effect we organized the efficient supervision of transportation work, increased the responsibility of anyone directly involved in transportation and energized the help provided by the party committees.

The CPSU Central Committee approved the practical experience of Lvov Oblast railroad transportation and industrial enterprises on the efficient utilization of freight cars in its 1981 decree. The Central Committee's support helped to develop and enrich this initiative. In 1975 the comprehensive system for the efficient utilization of freight cars had been applied at eight stations and 11 industrial enterprises in the Lvov area. In 1982 it was applied at 184 railroad stations and 819 enterprises in seven Ukrainian oblasts serviced by the line.

In a word, a great deal has changed for the better. Above all, the economical attitude toward freight cars has been developed. Whereas in 1975, when the application of the system was undertaken, idling along the entire railroad exceeded 1 million car/hours; in 1982 it had dropped to 62,400. In the Lvov section alone savings totaled tens of thousands of car/hours per year. Today there is no case of cars idling above the norm and rolling stock turnover has increased and is continuing to increase substantially.

The efficiency of the party committee is manifested most clearly in the unity between its plans and their implementation and its ability to struggle persistently for reaching its targets and complete initiated projects. A number of party committees can resolve even most difficult problems. Their vanguard role is enhanced in an important area such as capital construction.

The CPSU Central Committee decree "On Measures to Ensure the Implementation of Plans for the Construction of Housing and Social Projects" emphasizes that the strict implementation of the 11th Five-Year Plan for such construction is a most important task of major sociopolitical significance.

Today the construction workers in our oblast are increasingly adopting the firm rule of building quickly, economically and on a modern technical level. This was achieved, however, through searches, failures, arguments and risks and, in some cases, even excessive supervision by party committees. The only clear thing was the need for qualitatively new decisions in the organization of construction work.

The obkom studied the experience of a number of party organizations in the country, interpreted it and reached the conclusion that a unified party committee for construction workers had to be created through which the party's influence on the situation and, above all, on upgrading performing discipline and cadre responsibility could be intensified. The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee supported our proposal. A party committee was set up at the Lvovpromstroy Combine in 1977. It included the party committees of the Lvov House-Building Combine and the Lvovpromstroy, Lvovzhilstroy and Promkhimsantekhmontazh Trust. Convinced of the promising nature of a political management organ such as the combine party committee, we suggested that the possibility of creating a single economic organ--a main administration--be considered. Glavlvovpromstroy, the territorial Lvov Oblast main construction administration, was created by decision of the republic organs in August 1978.

Naturally, this laid a heavy responsibility on us. We realized that we had to prove the correctness of the way we had chosen.

This can be determined today on the basis of practical results. During the 10th Five-Year Plan the Glavlvovpromstroy collectives considerably increased their volume of contracting operations. During the current 11th Five-Year Plan their growth rates increased: they equaled 8.9 percent in 1981 and 5 percent in 1982. As a whole, during these 2 years all production capacities of prime governmental importance were commissioned on time, a large number of housing units was built and the plan for the completion of schools and preschool and medical institutions was fulfilled.

The principle which we are trying to assert in each oblast party organization unit is to work through the party organization and the party members, and not take over from the economic managers but help them to find proper solutions or see eventual errors. The questions we ask ourselves are, how were successes achieved? How to make them even greater?

The successes which the Glavlvovpomstroy party organization was able to achieve were the result, first of all, of the daily application of a practical approach to the solution of problems and, above all, the creation of a healthy moral-psychological climate in the labor collectives and the establishment of a stable structure of managing cadres in trusts and administrations; secondly, the concentration of manpower and material resources and reducing the number of simultaneously built projects; thirdly, establishing unity of action between general contractors and customers and cooperation between construction and installation workers; fourthly, resolving the problem of guaranteed deliveries of construction materials through the more efficient utilization of railroad and trucking facilities. Streamlining

conferences at construction projects and determining the range of participation and the precise time of holding them with no detriment to production work were also important.

The political management of capital construction was concentrated in the hands of the party's obkom, thus enhancing the responsibility of cadres for the proper formulation and implementation of plans and scheduled commissioning of projects. We were able to reduce the amount of unfinished construction and construction time and increase the share of capital investments in the reconstruction and technical retooling of operating enterprises.

The obkom directs the party organizations toward improving the work even further and toward developing in the cadres and all working people willpower and persistence in achieving new successes, intolerance toward shortcomings and the feeling that they are the masters of their country.

As was emphasized at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, a particularly important problem today is the implementation of the Food Program. Our oblast has 1,280,000 hectares in farmland, of which 857,000 are arable. This means no more than 0.33 hectares per capita. With this in mind, the party organizations, kolkhoz boards and sovkhoz managers give priority to the efficient use of the land and to upgrading farming standards. Virtually all kolkhozes and sovkhozes have mastered scientific crop rotation systems, streamlined their areas in crops and enhanced farming standards.

The problem of increasing the fertility of the land remains topical. In addition to all other methods, we are resolving it through the use of fertilizer--more than 13 tons of organic and 194 kilograms of chemical fertilizers per hectare. A number of farms are using crop programming. Seed growing and quality have improved substantially and more than 90 percent of the seeds today are first-grade.

This has enabled the kolkhozes and sovkhozes to increase their farm output; grain production was increased by 14.6 percent and sugar beets by 13.4 percent this five-year plan.

Animal husbandry, which accounts for more than one-half of the marketable kolkhoz and sovkhoz output, remains the oblast's leading agricultural sector. Feed production and increased productivity remain the decisive areas in animal husbandry. Areas under perennial grasses have been expanded in order to increase feed production. They account for nearly 20 percent of the areas under crops and approximately one-half of the feed crops. Progressive feed production and treatment technologies are being introduced.

We have set up an assembly line-shop milk production system which has enabled us to take most fully into consideration physiological and productive characteristics in feeding and caring for the cows, to develop intrafarm specialization, to improve the organization of the work and wages of the animal husbandrymen and to resolve a number of social problems. Under this system, all production processes are carried out in the interlactation period, calving, increasing the milk flow and insemination, and milking shops.

The assembly-line milk production system enabled us to increase cow productivity by an average of 300-350 kilograms per year. The Ukraina Kolkhoz, Kamenskiy-Bugskiy Rayon, which was the first to apply this system as early as 1973, has increased its dairy herd (1,100 cows) productivity by 1,200 kilograms.

Currently, 240 dairy farms, with more than 130,000 cows, are applying the new technology. Herd reproduction work has improved considerably. On an average, 100 cows give birth to 92-93 calves. Steps are being taken to improve breeding and apply the achievements of science and leading experience.

The fact that during the wintering season, public animal husbandry output increased and that more milk, meat and eggs were sold to the state compared to last year, is important.

The party obkom and raykoms pay great attention to upgrading the role and militancy of the primary party organizations in the struggle for high agricultural efficiency and increased party influence at decisive production sectors.

We proceed from the fact that the strict observance of Leninist norms of party life and management principles and the assertion of the Leninist workstyle are mandatory prerequisites for the successful activities of party organizations and party members and cadres. We are taking organizational-political steps to implement the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress aimed at enhancing the vanguard role of party members and all organizational and mass-political work. Not so long ago the party obkom sponsored a practical science conference on "The 26th CPSU Congress on Upgrading the Role of the Primary Party Organizations in Resolving Communist Construction Problems," at which the experience of all units within the oblast party organization was summed up. Numerous examples and facts prove that wherever close interaction has been ensured among organizational, ideological, economic and social factors in the life and activities of labor collectives, high end results are guaranteed.

With a view to ensuring the further strengthening of the party's influence, the plenary and party obkom meetings systematically study the activities of city and rayon committees and primary party organizations and draft the necessary recommendations. Furthermore, at each plenum the bureau informs the obkom members on the course of implementation of party and specifically obkom decrees. At plenary meetings discussions are frank and efficient. Their results are published in the oblast press and transmitted on the radio and the television.

The party organizations actively discussed the tasks formulated in the resolutions of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Means and methods of work are being reorganized in accordance with the stipulations formulated by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov at the plenum and his meeting with Moscow machine tool builders.

We have singled out in the entire set of party committee tasks based on the CPSU program and bylaws the main and particularly relevant ones, such as the consistent observance of party, state and labor discipline, the implementation of contractual obligations by each enterprise, upgrading the efficiency in the utilization of production capacities and material resources, eliminating all manifestations of parochialism and departmentalism, and blocking abuses of official position.

In this connection we reviewed our long-term and current plans for party work and maximally amended them to make them more specific and to intensify decision-making efficiency in an effort, as Lenin pointed out, "to get rid at all cost of commotion and confusion, commissions, talks and scribbling..." (op. cit., vol 44, p 364).

The extent to which the working time of party committee personnel is used skillfully, creatively and efficiently is particularly important today. Most of their time should be spent on giving practical help to the primary party organizations, to control and supervision of execution and to study cadres, the moral and political situation in labor collectives and the needs and demands of the working people. We consider that live contacts with workers, kolkhoz members, engineering and technical workers and employees and young people cannot be replaced by written or oral reports.

Efficiency develops in the course of the comprehensive process of organizational and ideological-political work. As also confirmed by our practical experience, nothing in this area is petty, secondary or insignificant. As the scale and complexity of economic and social development processes grow, so does substantially the role of the manager and the range of his activities. Specialized knowledge and production skills alone are insufficient if one is to be on the level of contemporary assignments. A profound knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory, firm inner conviction of the rightness of the communist cause, a militant party spirit and the skill to work with people are necessary.

The party efficacy of the manager on any level is characterized by long-range thinking and acting and the ability to see the problem in its entirety and to find more fruitful and optimal means to resolve it. As was emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress, extensive rights are being given managers who must use them to their fullest extent. Every one of them, however, must always remember his high responsibility to the people whom he has been instructed to lead, to the party and the entire nation.

Our oblast party organization is doing a great deal to develop in the cadres the qualities which today must be inherent in any leading worker, whatever his unit or level. We plan and implement proper measures on a differentiated basis, in accordance with the characteristics and specific nature of the individual economic, scientific and cultural sectors.

The party obkom, gorkoms and raykoms show an exacting attitude toward the personal participation of every manager in the education of the people. It has become the rule in promoting a comrade to a responsible elective or

economic position for the party organizations to take comprehensively into consideration not only his practical qualifications and organizational capabilities but his ability to find a common language with the people, to influence them politically and to seek the advice of the collective in making important decisions.

Let us point out that the party cadres have substantially developed politically and practically. Their general educational standard has risen and their outlook has broadened. Today many of them act as both skillful organizers and educators. In our oblast some 3,000 managers on all levels work as propagandists and heads of various courses and seminars. For example, in the Lvov city party organization secretaries and heads of gorkom and raykom departments work as propagandists directly in labor collectives. They not only disseminate Marxist-Leninist knowledge among the masses but also seek the advice of the working people on how more successfully to resolve problems of enhancing production efficiency, improving quality and strengthening labor discipline. This example has been followed by all oblast party committees who have assigned party workers and soviet and economic managers to work as propagandists among lagging labor collectives.

The working people have welcomed the direct participation of leading party, soviet, trade union and economic workers in party propaganda and their speeches to the population during the single policy days. Our observations indicate that this has largely contributed to enhancing the efficiency of party work as well. On the one hand, the labor collectives and the population are efficiently informed on major aspects of domestic and foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state and the activities of local party and soviet organs; on the other, the local situation is studied and shortcomings are exposed, as a result of which effective measures are actively taken to improve the work and mobilize the working people for resolving urgent problems.

It would be hardly necessary to prove the importance of the creation of an efficient and principle-minded atmosphere in the course of the address by a party committee secretary or enterprise, organization and establishment manager, so that the talk can be frank and intelligible and that every member of the audience could be given exhaustive answers to questions and check his views against the positions of the party organization in the labor collective. The main thing is to direct the people toward specific actions and substantial tangible results. Many of our executives are able to hold meetings with working people on a principled and efficient basis.

Frankly speaking, however, there still are officials who are merely trying to create an appearance of efficiency: they hold large numbers of meetings, sessions and planning gatherings, ring up the party committees and direct to them large numbers of documents on matters within the competence of the establishment they head. Of course, this has nothing in common with true party efficiency. Naturally, party management is provided through a variety of means and methods. However, such means and methods are justified and efficient only when they are used efficiently, when the implemented steps contribute to the formulation of proper decisions and the achievement of real results.

A decision, if its objective is clearly formulated, and the ways and means for implementing it within the stipulated deadline are defined, becomes a real manual for action. However, it can play its organizing and mobilizing role only under proper supervision of its implementation. Control and supervision of execution are an inseparable function of management and an indicator of efficiency and strict party discipline and order.

Efficiency is a specific concept which includes a set of requirements facing the manager and, as a whole, the managing of all aspects of social life. What was good yesterday may prove to be unsuitable today. This must not be forgotten. In speaking of the efficiency in agricultural production, for example, we must take into consideration natural-climatic conditions and the specific nature of one farm or another and its possibilities. In a word, the distribution of a memorandum applicable to all is inadmissible. A differentiated approach is needed.

The active and responsible attitude of every manager and party member toward the implementation of the party's programmatic and statutory requirements and tireless concern for improving matters in one's own organization are of great importance in improving workstyle and efficiency. Reports submitted by party members on their role at work and in social life has become our tried means for enhancing efficiency.

We believe that we can successfully cope with the tasks facing our party organization by increasing the party's influence, steadily improving management styles, forms and methods and promoting efficiency.

The working people of the order-bearing Lvov area approve with all their hearts the domestic and foreign policy of our party and Soviet state, and the policy of communist building and strengthening peace. Having noted through their shock labor the 60th anniversary of the USSR, they look at the future confidently, brimming with the desire to make an even greater contribution to the increased material and spiritual forces of our beloved homeland.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/13

GROWING ROLE OF LABOR COLLECTIVES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 64-72

[Article by Yu. Balandin, first secretary of the Kostroma CPSU Obkom]

[Text] Life itself and the practice of building communism determine the increased role and responsibility of labor collectives. With their extensive rights, codified in the USSR Constitution, they are called upon to act as an even more efficient constructive and educational force and to influence more energetically the production and social activities of the working people. As we know, the labor collectives participate in the discussion and resolution of major governmental and social problems, in production planning and social development and in strengthening labor and technological discipline. Their activities directly determine the application of scientific and technical achievements and progressive work methods. They are the main factor in the development of the socialist competition and in enhancing the political consciousness, culture and professional skills of the working people.

As everywhere else in the country, the people in our Kostroma Oblast are discussing with interest and warmly supporting the draft USSR Law on Labor Collectives and Upgrading Their Role in the Management of Enterprises, Establishments and Organizations. This document is a vivid manifestation of the consistent party course of developing socialist democracy and implementing Lenin's concepts on the participation of the toiling masses in the administration of production and governmental and social affairs.

Our oblast has about 1,000 collectives of enterprises in industry, transportation and communications and construction organizations, more than 300 kolkhozes and sovkhozes and about 8,000 collectives in services, health care, science and culture. The primary party organizations are their nucleus, their cementing force. All in all, we have more than 3,000 primary and shop party organizations and 2,000 party groups, rallying nearly 70,000 party members.

The militancy of the party organizations and the vanguard role of party members has been strengthened of late. Three-fourths of all party members and candidate members are directly employed in material production. More than 20,000 party members have earned the title of communist labor shock workers, about 12,000 are best in their profession, more than 8,000 are rationalizers and inventors, 6,800 are tutors of young people and almost 30,000 work as propagandists or heads of circles and seminars.

As the political organizers of labor collectives, the party organizations are contributing to the growth of their initiative and are focusing their efforts on the implementation of the party's assignments of further public production intensification and increased efficiency through the fuller utilization of existing opportunities for improving economic activities, accelerating scientific and technical progress and the growth of labor productivity and, in the final account, increasing output and improving its quality.

The principal criterion of the efficiency of the work of party committees and organizations is precisely for each labor collective successfully to fulfill its production and marketing plans, commission new capacities, housing and cultural projects, develop transportation, communications and services and systematically implement the program for agricultural upsurge in the Non-chernozem.

Problems of strengthening political influence on the situation in labor collectives and the exercise of their rights and fulfillment of their obligations are always the focal point of attention of the party obkom, gorkoms and raykoms and primary party organizations. It is with their help and under their guidance that enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhozes and rayons and the oblast at large that comprehensive plans for economic and social development are formulated and the efficiency of ideological and political-educational work and the strengthening of conscious labor discipline are enhanced. These plans define the basic problems related to improving working and living conditions and enhancing the skills and the political, general education and cultural standards of the working people.

Our daily practice convincingly proves that the mood of the people, the level of discipline, organization and order and the results of enterprise, kolkhoz and sovkhoz work depend tremendously on the extent to which the party organizations profoundly study the life of collectives and encourage and support their initiatives.

This is exemplified by the party organization at the Flax Combine imeni I. D. Zvorykin. The party organization pays attention to all production workers. It daringly undertakes the implementation of long-term tasks and is concerned with developing in the working people a feeling of responsibility for the activities of each subunit and the combine as a whole. The work of the enterprise is stable. During the first 2 years of the 11th Five-Year Plan 1.9 million linear meters of linen fabrics were produced above the plan and the plan for the first 3 years will be fulfilled by 20 November 1983. Additional output worth 7.3 million rubles will be produced. The party committee has enhanced the role of the party groups in the education of the people. The party members are setting personal examples at work and in society. Unquestionably, this has contributed to the fact that most brigades have become strong and efficient collectives. A healthy, comradely and practical atmosphere prevails among them. Many of their members consider conscientious work an inner need.

The party organization at the Kolkhoz imeni 50-Letiya SSSR, Kostromskiy Rayon, is the leading force of the collective. Its activities are focused on

developing a conscientious and creative attitude toward labor. The efforts of all party and kolkhoz members are directed toward applying progressive experience and technology and a scientific farming system. Comprehensive plans for economic and social development, upgrading crop yields and livestock productivity and cadre training and retraining are being implemented. The kolkhoz has been highly profitable for a number of years and has been fulfilling government assignments. Its grain crops have doubled in recent years, averaging more than 40 quintals per hectare. Note that this is achieved under Nonchernozem conditions!

However, we are also aware of the fact that not all collectives are coping with their tasks. That is why the party obkom directs the party organizations toward giving efficient help to laggards, achieve an overall upsurge, improve the work and raise it to the level of the requirements stipulated in the resolutions of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The development of the creative activeness and initiative of the masses is a comprehensive process. The entire arsenal of means of organizational, ideological and mass political work should be put to use on a differentiated basis, according to the nature of the production activities, training and requirements of the working people.

The collective's organizing and educational force is manifested most clearly in the extent to which every working person contributes to the common success. In his article "How to Organize the Competition?" Lenin wrote that it enables us to involve "the real majority of the working people in work in which they could prove themselves, develop their capabilities, and reveal talents which are a virgin spring among the people..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 35, p 195).

The socialist competition is a tried method for developing a conscious, a creative attitude toward labor. A number of oblast production collectives are successfully upgrading work efficiency and quality. Initiatives on the ahead-of-schedule fulfillment of the 11th Five-Year Plan, economic utilization of manpower resources and ensuring increased production without increasing the size of the personnel have become widespread.

The number of examples of socialist competition organized on the level of contemporary requirements is growing. Thus, the formulation of obligations at the Flax Combine imeni V. I. Lenin begins at the lower levels: the individual working person, followed by the brigade and the shop define their targets and specific objectives. The engineering and technical personnel, the administrative apparatus and the propagandists assist them in the economic substantiation of their targets. A kind of "defense" of socialist obligations takes place at worker meetings, i.e., their grounds are substantiated. Competition results are summed up daily for brigades and shops and weekly for production lines and the entire combine. The course of the competition is extensively covered through visual agitation facilities. Great significance is ascribed to reciprocal investigations conducted among competing collectives and joint discussions of means of utilizing available reserves. The best work methods are studied at progressive experience courses.

The same type of competition organization has been developed in the other labor collectives. Today virtually all workers employed in material production, services, science and culture are involved in one type of competition or another. Using rich past experience, acquired particularly in the course of the socialist competition in honor of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR, the party, trade union, Komsomol and economic organs try to relate the competition even more closely to the solution of the problems facing the collectives.

All of this has contributed to the fact that in the first 2 years of the 11th Five-Year Plan the oblast sold industrial goods worth more than 30 million rubles above the plan. The entire production increase was the result of higher labor productivity. The production of about 1,000 new types of commodities was mastered and the share of superior-quality goods in the entire certifiable production exceeded 30 percent.

Last year agriculture fulfilled its plans for sales of grain, potatoes, vegetables and eggs to the state; milk, meat and flax production increased and more coarse and fresh feeds were procured. The work of the construction organizations improved somewhat. Their material and technical base strengthened and their efficiency in the use of capital investments improved. The cities of Kostroma and Buy, Kostromskiy and Krasnoselskiy rayons and many collectives in the oblast were the acknowledged winners in the all-union and republic socialist competition in honor of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR.

The practical experience of the best collectives is a blend of progressive experience, the achievements of science and modern technology, good organization of labor and production and model united and creative work. The dissemination of their experience in all sectors is the continuing concern of the oblast party organization.

In the light of the tasks set at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the Conference of First Secretaries of Central Committees of Communist Parties of Union Republics and Party Kraykoms and Obkoms, which took place on 18 April 1983, a great deal remains to be done in order to increase industrial output and to develop agriculture. The importance of this is further enhanced by the fact that we still have enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhozes and construction organizations which do not make full use of their reserves and opportunities, and who fail to fulfill their plans for production, marketing and increased labor productivity. The struggle for economy and thrift has not become a daily project everywhere.

Need we point out that further improvements in the party's guidance of economic construction has become quite topical. The party committees and organizations must encourage all labor collectives to work persistently and to implement their planned assignments and socialist pledges. The interests of the state, society and the individual demand that problems be solved precisely as a common project of the collective and the individual worker on the basis of the further development of labor activeness and strengthened conscious organization and discipline.

High responsibility, discipline, initiative-mindedness and organization are qualities which essentially determine the civic stance of the Soviet person. The party organizations try to develop these qualities by enhancing the educational role of labor collectives. The significance of the support by the collective of progressive initiatives and examples and models of good work is universally known. Its opinion and reaction to one worker action or another are authoritative and effective. A principle-minded and efficient moral-psychological climate develops within the entire collective when the workers, kolkhoz members or employees themselves discuss and take steps to bring order.

Many are the oblast's collectives which maintain proper discipline and efficient order and organization. For example, persistent efforts are being made at the Plant for Silicate Bricks, under the guidance of the party organization, to see to it that no worker is careless or indifferent to the common cause. Cases of disciplinary violations are discussed at open party and worker meetings. Unannounced inspections are made by people's controllers on the use of the working time, legal knowledge is disseminated and an atmosphere of intolerance toward disciplinary violations is developed. On the suggestion of the workers violators are transferred to lower-paid jobs. They are partially or totally deprived of bonuses and subsidized trips to sanatoriums and rest homes. They are allowed to take their annual leave during the winter and lose priority in obtaining housing. Meanwhile, the plant is engaged in technical retooling and reconstruction of the production process and the mechanization of labor-intensive processes. Working, living and recreational conditions are being improved. This is beneficially influencing the growth of labor productivity, lowering personal turnover and strengthening the discipline.

"We need," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said, addressing the Moscow machine tool building workers, "conscientious labor discipline, the type of discipline which would advance the production process. We must give a greater meaning to the struggle for discipline and directly relate it to the implementation of production assignments. In such cases no efforts would be wasted and the stipulations of the November party Central Committee plenum would be implemented."

Tangible results are achieved by organizing the production process and involving the labor collectives themselves in this matter. However, this task should not be oversimplified. Not all collectives have joined as yet the struggle for discipline. Here and there a tolerant attitude is shown toward absenteeists, loafers, drunks, and people who show up for work late and leave before the shift is over. Although unproductive working time losses are declining, they remain substantial. Their further reduction, improved utilization of manpower, and strengthened exigency toward cadres for the creation of the necessary organizational and economic conditions for the uninterrupted and rhythmical work by the collectives and the development of an atmosphere of intolerance of any manifestations of disorganization and disciplinary violations remain among the important tasks.

To this effect we are taking comprehensive steps to improve mass political work and labor and moral upbringing and ensure the fuller use of measures for exerting moral and material influence.

Particular importance is ascribed to the application of the brigade form of labor organization, which has already proved its advantages. The new types of brigades have achieved substantial time and manpower and material resource savings. They maintain stronger discipline. They have achieved higher labor productivity and improved personnel skills and responsibility for the prompt and qualitative implementation of assignments.

Here is a typical example. Following the conversion to the brigade form of labor organization, the Kostromamebel' Production Association substantially improved its technical and economic indicators. Here planned assignments or output norms are met by every single shop, sector, brigade or piece-rate worker; unproductive working time losses have declined by almost 25 percent. It is indicative that with less personnel last year marketable output increased by 6 percent, labor productivity rose by 7 percent and outlays per ruble marketable output declined by 2 percent; above-plan furniture worth half a million rubles was delivered to the commercial organizations.

The timber procurement brigade headed by D. A. Yermolayev at the Vokhma Forestry Farm is distinguished by its stable work and high discipline. It reached the highest output in the sector by fulfilling three annual assignments during the first 2 years of the five-year plan.

The new forms of labor organization are being applied in agriculture as well. For more than 10 years three mechanized teams at the Kolkhoz imeni XX Parts "yezda, Kostromskiy Rayon, have applied the collective contracting method. During the 10th Five-Year Plan they increased the average annual grain crop yields from 12 to 19 quintals; perennial grass hay from 23 to 42 quintals and fresh feed for silage from 100 to 245 quintals per hectare. Output per team member increased by 38 percent.

Nevertheless, the brigade contracting method is still being applied too slowly and not always systematically. This method of labor organization is applied by about 60 percent of workers in industry and some 30 percent in construction. Few are the rural teams and brigades in which the work of the crop grower or livestock breeder is related to end results. We are also feeling the effect of omissions in the organization of the production process and the conservative way of thinking of some managers. The party obkom, gorkoms and raykoms are structuring their work with an emphasis on eliminating such shortcomings, achieving the increasingly extensive application of the brigade contracting method and making the new form of labor organization and incentive dominant in all material production sectors.

As Lenin taught us, it is important "for the conscientious worker not only to feel that he is the master of his plant but the representative of the country ..." (op. cit., vol 36, p 369).

The USSR Draft Law on Labor Collectives defines their basic rights and obligations and their powers in the administration of enterprises, establishments and organizations. The adoption of this law will enhance even further the role of the labor collective--the basic cell of the socialist society--and will broaden opportunities for the participation of the masses in the administration of social affairs.

Methods of participation of the working people in production management such as worker meetings, permanent production conferences, brigade and mechanizer councils, party organization commissions in charge of controlling administrative economic activities, people's control groups and posts and others, have become widespread in our oblast as throughout the country. Thus, the permanent production conference at the Kostroma Air Heater Plant, which consists of 8 percent of the entire personnel, issues specific recommendations on the installation of new equipment, mechanization of labor-intensive processes, improving production design and other matters. The implementation of a single proposal on the use of wasteless technology enabled the plant to save 300 tons of aluminum type and produce additional goods worth 750,000 rubles in 1982.

Social councils are gaining increasing recognition. Councils of livestock breeders and mechanizers are successfully operating at the Rodina Kolkhoz, Krasnoselskiy Rayon. They participate in the allocation of new equipment, bonuses and apartments. They are members of the kolkhoz board to which they submit recommendations on improving the organization of the work, sum up the results of the socialist competition and hear reports submitted by kolkhoz members on their labor contribution.

The role of worker meetings is increasing. For example, problems of economy and thrift, the use of new forms of labor organization and wages, strengthening discipline and utilization of bonus funds are frequently discussed by them at the Buy Chemical Plant. The plant's collective initiated an oblast socialist competition for maximal conservation of labor, material and energy resources on the basis of the accelerated utilization of the achievements and technology and is successfully fulfilling its obligations.

However, we cannot fail to see that in some places the social production management methods are underestimated. Some councils and permanent production conferences limit themselves to a consideration of petty current economic matters. Occasionally poorly prepared questions are submitted for discussion. The people are not always informed on the way their proposals are acted upon. Need we point out that this is reflected on the results of the production activities of the labor collective and hinders the full utilization of its creative potential. The further development of democratic methods for involving the working people in production management is one of the important tasks facing the party organizations.

"The meaning of the party's efforts to improve management and upgrade organization, efficiency and planning, state and labor discipline," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized in his article "The Doctrine of Karl Marx and Some Problems of Socialist Construction in the USSR," "is not only to avoid some

shortcomings and difficulties, which in itself is tremendously important, but in the final account, to strengthen even further the foundations on which the socialist way of life is erected."

One of our topical problems is to reinforce labor collectives with young cadres, the ideological and labor upbringing of the youth, their vocational guidance and keeping them in their jobs. The oblast is doing extensive work on the labor education and upbringing of boys and girls. It involves the participation of party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organs, virtually all administrations and departments, school faculties, and the public. A system of labor associations of school students is in operation, the range of working skills in which the students are trained is broadening and the role of the labor collectives in this important matter is being enhanced. A competition has developed between towns and rayons, enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhozes and schools for the better organization of the labor training of the working people.

A patriotic initiative was launched in our oblast by young people during the 10th Five-Year Plan. They resolved to go to work in production immediately after secondary school graduation. The initiative met with a lively response and support on the part of the young generation. Over the past 7 years alone more than 54,000 school and vocational-technical school graduates joined the oblast's national economy and 15,000 of them became rural workers.

The young people are having an increasing influence on the work level of enterprises and farms. Today nearly one-half of the mechanizers, one out of seven animal husbandrymen and one out of two specialists are people under 30. The decline in the able-bodied share of the rural population has stopped in many rayons and availability of mass skill cadres at the farms has increased. Today young people account for more than half of the labor collective in many kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

This situation was achieved above all thanks to the increased attention paid by the party, soviet and economic organizations to youth problems and the comprehensive solution of a broad range of social and educational problems. For example, 196,000 square meters of housing were built, running water and central heating were installed at more than 87 percent of available housing, 90 percent of all premises were supplied with natural gas, good roads lead out of central farmsteads and the needs of agricultural production workers for schools, kindergartens and clubs are almost entirely met as a result of the efforts made during the past and the first 2 years of the current five-year plan. In most farms dairy operations have become comprehensively mechanized. Machinery parts, repair workshops and sheds for tractors and automotive machinery have been built. Experienced instructors are assigned to teach the young rural workers and young families are given priority in receiving comfortable housing.

The way and rhythm of life greatly changed at the Soligalichskaya PMK-13 [Mobile Reclamation Combine] of the Kostromamelioratsiya Association with the advent of the young generation. Manpower shortages were eliminated, cadre turnover was surmounted, production organization improved and labor productivity increased.

The average age of the working people at the Rus' Sovetskaya Kolkhoz, Ostrovskiy Rayon, is 28. A sympathetic moral-psychological climate has developed in the kolkhoz. Relations among people are imbued with reciprocal respect. Violations of labor discipline have been practically eliminated. It was no accident that in 1982 the kolkhoz overfulfilled its assignment for the sale of grain to the state by nearly 100 percent and successfully fulfilled its plans for milk, meat and flax deliveries. Net profits exceeded 300,000 rubles, whereas in the past the farm operated at a loss.

Reinforcing the countryside with educated people has a beneficial influence on all aspects of rural life. Understandably, the influx of young people into agriculture will demand of the party, Komsomol, soviet and trade union and economic organs improvements in work methods, use of new labor organization forms, improvements in the way of life and cultural recreation and the creation of conditions for upgrading the educational and vocational standards of the working people, i.e., a consideration of the totality of educational, organizational, social, demographic and other factors which determine the success of the project.

At its plenum, the Obkom formulated and approved a comprehensive plan of measures for further intensification of the work with rural youth and the creation of stable collectives in kolkhozes, sovkhozes, other agricultural enterprises and construction organizations. As a result of its implementation, 120 animal husbandry farms were comprehensively mechanized, more than 50 repair workshops, garages and technical service centers were built, and an industrial technology for flax cultivation and harvesting was applied during the first 2 years of the 11th Five-Year Plan. A total of 388,000 square meters of comfortable housing was commissioned. New kindergartens, schools, cafeterias, clubs and service reception centers were opened.

The party organizations closely see to it that the equipment given the young workers and kolkhoz members is in good condition or new, that progressive technology is used at Komsomol-youth livestock farms and complexes, that high-level labor mechanization is achieved and that progressive means and methods of work are taught. The party member-instructors, consisting of production veterans and frontrankers, help the young men and women, school and vocational-technical school graduates to enter production life more quickly, to adapt themselves to labor collectives more easily and to surmount the difficulties encountered at the start of an independent labor career.

Naturally, many unresolved problems remain in the efforts to keep the young people in production, particularly in the countryside. Expanding the use of female labor in agricultural production requires constant attention. The solution of this problem is vitally necessary in order to keep young girls in the villages and to eliminate the disproportion between the sexes.

A great deal remains to be done in housing construction, mass cultural work and consumer services, trade, medical and communal services to the rural population, the reorganization of villages and hamlets and housing construction. Such problems were recently considered at the party obkom plenum and a specific program for action through the end of the current five-year plan and beyond it was formulated.

We shall continue to enhance the role of the party organizations in labor collectives in the efforts to keep young people in production, ensure their ideological-political and moral upbringing, involve them in the solution of social problems and see to it that no one remains outside of this important project.

The collective has many social functions, one of the most important of which is educational. In implementing the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Further Improving Ideological and Political-Educational Work," the oblast party organizations are concerned with upgrading the educational role of the collective and the ideological-political maturity of its members. This is accomplished through political and economic training and various forms of mass political and individual work.

The main purpose is to see to it that in the course of the study of revolutionary theory and party policy the people strengthen their convictions, adopt an active life stance and convert their knowledge into a manual for action and learn, as Lenin said, "to act as is truly demanded by communism" (op. cit., vol 41, p 302).

This makes it incumbent upon the party organizations steadily to strengthen the links between propaganda and life and the solution of economic and political problems and comprehensively to support everything that is new and progressive and firmly oppose that which hinders our advancement. The role of the labor collectives must be increased in surmounting adverse manifestations such as money-grubbing, negligence, various types of violations of public order, drunkenness and alcoholism. The use of the power of labor collectives and public organizations has enabled us of late to lower somewhat the number of delinquencies caused by drunkenness. These efforts will be continued.

Practical experience indicates that wherever the norms of communist morality are not simply proclaimed but become universally mandatory and wherever the collective engages in assessing the behavior and actions of every individual, the opposite takes place as well--the labor collective itself strengthens and becomes more mature and united.

The efficacy of public opinion and its educational influence largely depend on the level of information of the working people. The oblast has developed an efficient political information system consisting of single policy days, information conferences, business meetings, and question-and-answer evenings. Equally justified are methods such as confirmation as a worker or grain grower, celebration of labor dynasties, and creation of labor glory museums at enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

A great deal in the life of a collective depends on the manager, on the way he takes into consideration the mood of the people and the efficiency with which his decisions affect this mood. For this reason, the oblast party organization is persistently teaching the economic managers the skill to combine organizational with educational functions in their activities. The method of conviction, unity between word and action and personal example must become inseparable features in the workstyle of all managers.

Not so long ago an all-union symposium on the mentality of primary production collectives and a practical science conference on "Psychological Problems of the Primary Collective and the Individual in Light of the Decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress" were held in Kostroma with the participation of leading psychologists from many parts of the country. Socioscientific work was done on problems such as "Development of Labor Collectives and Rational Utilization of Manpower Resources" and "Economic Laws Governing the Development of the Socialist Competition and the Socioeconomic Activity of the Working People Under Developed Socialist Conditions." Thorough studies based on specific data enable us to select the types of means and methods of organizational and political work in labor collectives which prove themselves most effective.

Daily practice proves that strengthening labor collectives, developing their creative activity and upgrading the ideological-political standard of the working people are the most important prerequisites for the successful implementation of party decisions and concepts and great tasks in building communism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/13

CEMA: ECONOMIC STRATEGY FOR THE EIGHTIES

PM021540 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 73-84

[Article by Academician O. Bogomolov]

[Text] In the late '70s and early '80s a new situation has emerged in the development of the CEMA countries' economy and cooperation and in East-West economic collaboration. This situation requires a considerable increase in production efficiency and improvement in the technical standard and competitiveness of output. Despite differences in the specific situation in individual countries, it may be said that a substantial advance in this direction has become the essential condition for the socialist community's further economic progress. The aims and priorities of the socioeconomic strategy for the '80s and the subsequent period are being defined and specified accordingly. The correct choice today is a guarantee of a major gain in the future.

New Situation in the Development of the Economy and Mutual Cooperation

What is happening in the European socialist countries can most correctly be described as a transition from the extensive economic management which prevailed in the past to a modern economy of the intensive type. This transition is relatively complex in itself. Suffice it to recall that the expansion of fuel and raw material extraction alone already requires sharply increasing expenditures. After all, the CEMA countries, where 10 percent of the world population lives, account for up to 30 percent of world electricity generation and oil, natural gas, coal, and steel production. And all this despite the fact that not only did the age of cheap energy and raw material end in the '70s, but there was also a sharp reduction in the flow of additional manpower.

The modernization of the processing industry's increased production apparatus, the development of science, the transfer of agricultural production to an industrial footing--all this also now entails incomparably greater expenditures than before. It is not surprising that economic growth today has begun to depend almost entirely on increasing labor productivity and the efficiency of use of existing resources. It is this new stage which the socialist economy has entered, overcoming a certain force of inertia.

The CEMA countries continue to encounter a whole series of consequences of insufficient economic intensification. They include limits on many types of

resources and an imbalance between production and consumption, notably in consumer goods. For some CEMA countries, agriculture and other sectors of the agroindustrial complex and the underdevelopment of the national economic infrastructure, especially transport and storage facilities, remain a bottleneck. The lag behind the world standard in terms of the quality, durability, and reliability of a number of items produced and the shortage of spare parts make it more difficult to saturate domestic markets with commodities. All this restricts opportunities for investing new funds in the national economy and expanding the population's consumption and ultimately dampens economic growth. The CEMA countries' gross industrial output in the period 1976-80 increased by an average of 4.8 percent, whereas in 1981 and 1982 this indicator was approximately 2.2 percent.

Yet the socialist community countries have the basic material preconditions for resolving their problems. It is a case of fully operationalizing them and using them to good effect. The recent fraternal party congresses demanded this most resolutely.

The problems which have arisen were hastily declared by Western observers to be "an economic crisis within CEMA." Such conclusions have nothing in common with the truth.

Despite the difficulties and considerable expenses in the intensification process (it began back in the '70s) the CEMA countries' economy is developing considerably more dynamically than that of the EEC states. In the 1971-82 period their national income increased 70 percent while that of the EEC countries increased 30 percent. The past 2 years cannot be termed favorable for the socialist community. Nonetheless, from their results it is possible to judge that the socialist economy's adaptation to new, tougher conditions has begun and is gathering momentum.

Changes are also imminent in the CEMA countries' economic cooperation.

Thanks to the policy of socialist economic integration, a sufficiently high level of interaction between the national economies has been achieved. This can be judged if only by the value of reciprocal deliveries of goods and services, which averages over 18 percent of the CEMA countries' total national income. Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, and Czechoslovakia dispatch 30 to 40 percent of the machinery and equipment they produce to the CEMA market. Of course, the level of development of foreign economic relations and their effectiveness in the national economy are uneven in individual countries. However, for many of them further economic growth is already conditioned by the expansion at a preferential pace of foreign trade exchange and international production and scientific-technical sharing.

The socialist countries are taking part in large-scale joint projects of which there are only a few in world practice. They include main pipelines, power lines, nuclear power stations, mining and enrichment combines, and so forth. In contrast to the EEC, which depends for half its needs on the import of fuel from third countries, our community satisfies 90 to 95 percent of its own needs not only for energy resources but also for other vitally

important types of raw material. In the 10th Five-Year Plan the Soviet Union exported 378 million tons of oil, 52 million tons of petroleum products, 94 cubic meters of natural gas, and 64 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity to these countries. In all, in 1976-80 exports of Soviet energy resources to the CEMA countries can be expressed as approximately 830 million tons of standard fuel. The supply of fuel and raw material, guaranteed by long-term contracts and plans, is a considerable advantage in our time, full of various surprises.

But the intensification of economic integration in the '80s and '90s is linked to the solution of a number of new problems. Above all the need has emerged to make amendments to the present concept of the division of labor. This is connected primarily with the fact that opportunities for further increasing exports of some types of fuel and raw material from the USSR are restricted. The changeover to the less efficient development of deposits is a long way from the center and the resultant need to increase capital investments, transport expenditures, and so forth have an effect here. That is why an increase in reciprocal trade within the CEMA framework can be expected mainly from the development of international specialization and sharing in the production of finished output, units and components. We already have considerable experience in this field. You only have to recall large-scale international projects like the production of computers, microelectronic equipment, equipment for nuclear power stations, trucks, and petroleum refining equipment. Now we must make further headway.

Another urgent task is connected with improving the economic conditions of exchange in accordance with the principles of ensuring mutual advantage and mutual preferences. It is well-known that a preferential system has taken shape within the CEMA framework for the exchange of output and for production and technical sharing, built on a stable planned basis.

This system offers real advantages to each of its members. These advantages consist in the opportunity to form a more progressive export structure than in relations with developed capitalist countries (a higher proportion of machinery and equipment) and to acquire many types of commodities, sometimes when other import successes are lacking, in a system of two-way accounting which does not require spare currency reserves.

For the USSR the CEMA countries are suppliers of a considerable quantity of machinery, equipment, and consumer goods. For instance, in 1976-80 they met up to 40 percent of the USSR's requirements for seagoing and river ships and leaders, up to 26 percent of its requirements for passenger cars and 13 percent of its requirements for buses, approximately 30 percent of its rolling equipment needs and approximately 50 percent of its requirements for automated telephone stations. The delivery of agricultural equipment from these countries is equivalent to 13 percent of the volume of its production in the USSR. Equipment received from the CEMA countries now produces 40 percent of canned fruit and vegetables, 30 percent of sugar and confectionery, and 15 percent of dairy products. Approximately 20 percent of the stocks of footwear in intraunion retail trade turnover and 15 percent of stocks of furniture, ready-to-wear clothing, and canned food are provided by deliveries from the

CEMA countries. Imports from the CEMA countries satisfy 30 percent of sugar consumption, 7-8 percent of fruit, berry, and grape consumption, and 2 percent of meat consumption.

For our CEMA partners the advantages of reciprocal exchange consist not only in the supply of raw material and fuel on a long-term basis, in a number of cases at prices considerably below world prices, but also in the acquisition of scientific and technical results under preferential conditions and large credits at low interest rates.

The implementation of the comprehensive program defining the main avenues of integration and other joint ventures has made a major contribution to the development and improvement of the system of cooperation within the CEMA framework. In particular, ways of improving the economic conditions of cooperation have been developed.

In this connection it is necessary, for instance, to step up the role of material incentives in improving the quality, technical standard, and competitiveness of reciprocally supplied output and for expanding the export of scarce output to the CEMA countries' markets. As yet, unfortunately, a reduction is taking place in the proportion of food and consumer goods deliveries in the overall volume of reciprocal trade--which does not accord with the interests of many of our countries. Often food is sold using free currency in payment. The proportion of agricultural output and food in reciprocal trade turnover between the CEMA countries is only 10 percent as against 13 percent in the EEC, while the proportion of industrial consumer goods is 9 and 25 percent respectively.

In meeting import requirements for a number of types of machinery and equipment, the role of the CEMA countries' reciprocal trade dropped during the '70s (sometimes by a factor of 2-3). In 1976-80 the cost of their annual purchases of machine building output in the West averaged about 9 billion rubles. In 1980 the capitalist states' share in the CEMA countries' imports of equipment for the chemical industry reached 65 percent; mining, metallurgical, and petroleum equipment, 52 percent; and metal-cutting equipment, 49 percent. There was a clearly revealed trend here toward preferential rates for the growth of purchases of output from production sectors which have been and remain the determining ones in the European CEMA countries' machine building. The increase in imports of metal output and food from the West cannot be regarded as normal.

The change in the correlation of prices for fuel and raw material commodities and finished output has resulted in the deterioration of conditions of exchange and the balance of payments for many CEMA countries. At the same time prices for fuel in reciprocal trade have been and so far remain substantially below world prices, which means that fuel exporters are offering preferential terms to fuel importers. Since these preferential terms are mostly of a one-sided nature, it becomes urgent to ensure more equal material interest among all participants in exchange. This makes it necessary to improve the economic mechanism of cooperation and to make it more flexible and capable of adapting rapidly to a new situation.

The CEMA countries have to draw most weighty conclusions in connection with the aggravation of the international situation and the crisis of the world capitalist economy. The cold war winds blowing from across the ocean are aggravating the conditions for East-West trade. And that is all the more alarming in that difficulties of a purely economic order already exist here.

They include primarily settling accounts with the West in freely convertible currency. The payment of the principal and the interest on it under conditions in which the United States is boycotting trade deals is becoming a complex problem for the CEMA countries. They are also having to review their strategy because the depth of the advancing economic crisis in the West has been obviously underrated.

In the early '70s the decline in business activity and the reduction of orders in many industries compelled the European and U.S. banks hastily to seek a profitable place to invest their money and made them responsible to the CEMA countries' requests for credit. But not enough consideration was given here to the fact that reimbursement of the credits provided requires the creation of normal conditions for exports from the CEMA countries to Western markets. Instead, just the opposite is happening--protectionism and discrimination against the socialist countries are being stepped up. In addition, in an attempt to "penalize" the USSR and a number of other countries, new restrictions are being introduced on the import of many goods from these countries and the supply of modern technology to them. The risk involved in industrial cooperation with the Western firms has been revealed most clearly, and this cooperation must be approached more circumspectly.

Thus, in both their internal development and their foreign relations, the CEMA countries have been faced with many new and difficult economic tasks. The problems they are encountering have nothing in common with the ailments of modern capitalism--production stagnation and recession, mounting inflation, and unemployment. Nevertheless it is clear from their party and state decisions that in the current decade the CEMA countries must modify the methods of their economic policy, their planning practice, and their actual economic thinking to take account of the radical change in the conditions and factors of economic growth.

Strategic Response for the Challenge of the '80s

The central task of the economic strategy for the '80s set by the congresses of the majority of CEMA countries' fraternal parties is intensification. It presupposes substantial changes both in the mechanism of economic administration and in the economy's sectorial structure and technical base. Because of the interrelated nature of economic life, the desired changes can be achieved all the more successfully here, the more coordinated the individual countries' actions are. The internationalization of socialist economic management experience includes many opportunities for further joint progress.

The restructuring of the system of economic management, reinforced by measures to impart specific detail and to coordinate the structural policy and strategy of growth, is one of the main paths of intensification.

Past experience says that the most crucial part of any management activity is the formulation of strategic objectives for the future. Miscalculations in economic strategy (for instance, the wrong priorities in allocating capital investments to the sectors, in foreign economic relations, the growth rates and structure of consumption, or the reassessment of existing resources) can cause particularly great harm under the conditions of the centralized planning of the economy.

One of the main avenues of the economic strategy of the majority of CEMA countries for the '80s is the reduction of the proportion of energy-intensive and materials-intensive production facilities and manufacturing processes. Thus, in ferrous metallurgy this means being geared toward increasing the production not of conventional steel and rolled metal but of high-quality brands and types. Other industrial sectors must be completed with second and third "stories" for processing and refining their final output, be it metal, petroleum, or leather.

An important place in the structural reorganizations of the '80s and '90s is assigned to machine building and the acceleration of the development of a number of its sectors. This relates, for instance, to the production of equipment for the open-cut mining of minerals, main pipelines, and the complete mechanization of individual types of agricultural work, for the food industry, and for the mechanization of manual labor, particularly in construction and warehouse and loading operations, and in trade.

Various "sanctions" imposed by the U.S. administration on East-West relations also prompt us to accelerate the process of these structure reorganizations.

Increasing the production of agricultural output in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries must also be included among the central tasks of their economic strategy. Vigorous steps are being taken to ensure that the agroindustrial complex develops harmoniously in all its parts (arable farming and stockraising, storage and processing) so that labor productivity here is increased. The return on these efforts will increase, and a corresponding reduction can be expected in the import of grain from the capitalist countries, as can an increase in the proportion of agricultural commodities in the CEMA countries' reciprocal exchange.

The long-term economic strategy pays paramount attention to restoring the balance in economic development, which has been disrupted in a number of CEMA countries. The most important economic proportions to observe include the correct correlation between the growth of energy consumption in the national economy and the rates of overall economic development, between the production of the means of production and consumer goods, between the increase in the populations' money incomes and the expansion of the consumer goods and services offered on the domestic market, and an even balance of payment.

In the interests of ensuring economic balance, a number of CEMA countries have been obliged to curb the growth of investments and the populations' real incomes. In 1981-1985 the tempo of economic development in the majority of CEMA countries, as we can see from their national economic plans, will be

somewhat reduced, while at the end of the '80s, after structural and other reorganization in their economies, it may be expected that prerequisites will be created for their more dynamic development.

The prospects for accelerating the economic growth rate of the CEMA countries are, of course, among the central issues of their long-term strategy. If by tempo we understand relative increases in the national income created in the country, that is, the real expansion in the resources available to society for accumulation and consumption, then their size is undoubtedly the most important criterion of socioeconomic progress. Dynamic expanded reproduction assured by the advantages of the new social system by comparison with capitalism accords with the working people's interests and the demands of the main economic law of socialism and its other laws. Of course, rates are not important for their own sake, and it is not a case of speed at any price. No one would like to repeat the historical examples of "leaps forward" at rates attained at the cost of reducing output quality and disregarding the interests of the prompt renovation of the national economy's fixed capital or the development of individual sectors of the economy like, for instance, the extracting industries, agriculture, light industry, transport, and so forth.

It is a case of stepping up rates through intensification of the economy, the restoration of economic balance, and the activation of all other growth factors, social and moral factors included. And this strategic orientation retains its full importance. Moreover, it is obviously from this viewpoint that the effectiveness of economic building will be assessed in the long term and over the next two or three five-year plans.

The improvement of the population's living standard, the corresponding increase of food and consumer goods production, and the expansion of the services sphere are part of the socialist community countries' long-term economic strategy, not only as its most important goal but also as an essential condition for ensuring dynamic and balanced development. The working people are socialist society's main production force. That is why the improvement of their culture and professional qualifications, the amelioration of their daily lives, and the increasingly fuller satisfaction of all their growing material and spiritual requirements are essential to a constant improvement in work quality and, consequently, productivity.

Of course, personal consumption can increase only as the return on labor and the efficiency of the entire national economy increase. But, on the other hand, the growth of consumption when wages are correctly organized has always acted as an effective incentive to improving labor productivity and organization. Hence the aim of making better use of this incentive both in current economic policy and, especially, in long-term economic policy is understandable.

The CEMA countries have great opportunities for increasing production output by saving raw material, energy and manpower. They also have large-scale reserves for enhancing labor productivity through strengthening labor discipline, improving organization and stepping up moral and material incentives. To reveal these reserves and opportunities more fully, collective experience

attests that it is necessary to have not only a correct strategy for economic growth and a considered structural policy but also reforms of the economic mechanism which the CEMA countries have been carrying out since the mid-'60s. Now these reforms are becoming more radical: The financing of investments from the state budget is being cut back; financing of these investments through bank credits and the enterprises' own funds is expanding; state subsidies to profitable enterprises are being reduced; the growth of wages is being made more dependent on labor productivity; and prices are being improved.

Steps are being taken to strengthen enterprises' economic autonomy. At the same time state control is being stepped on over their observance of the existing financial regulations. Reforms also provide for the improvement of centralized state planning designed to define the main economic proportions and ensure the implementation of plans using all economic levers at the state's disposal (credit, prices, taxes, financial norms), and not only through direct assignments to enterprises.

The socialist countries' experience shows that a particularly major role in improving the economic mechanisms is played by the correct organizational structure for the management of industry, agriculture, construction and the services sphere. As is well known, this structure stems from the laws for concentrating and centralizing production under socialism, which are by no means absolute but have their own specific features and their own borders in various economic sectors. The correct allocation of authority in taking economic decisions, and their elaboration at the level where this can be done most knowledgeably, is one of the main prerequisites of the struggle against bureaucratism and of enhanced management efficiency. For instance, with the aid of combines which unite the main elements of the reproduction cycle--from science and the production of experimental models to the sale and subsequent servicing of the relevant types of output--the GDR is successfully resolving many problems of technical progress, the saving of raw material, fuel and semifinished materials, and the fuller satisfaction of national economic requirements. Other CEMA countries are also actively seeking forms of production concentration and centralization suited to the present level of economic and technical development.

Measures to improve economic mechanisms have a number of common avenues: the consolidation of the centralized planning principle with a view to ensuring the interests of all the people and overcoming narrow departmental and local tendencies; the expansion of the financially autonomous foundations of the enterprises and associations, the intensification of economic regulators and norms; the consistent implementation of the principle of pay related to the quantity and quality of labor and its national economic results; the linking of economic with social solutions; and the further development of socialist democracy in production and management.

At the same time, each country has its own features and economic reforms which differ in depth, the rate at which they are carried out, their comprehensiveness, and many specific decisions. Their results have not yet had a proper effect in overcoming the dissipation of capital investments and

shortening the investment cycle, accelerating technical progress and the introduction of its achievements, and enhancing the competitiveness of output. Advances in live labor productivity and the saving of energy, raw and semi-finished materials are also inadequate in the majority of countries. A lack of coordination is to be observed in those elements of reforms which directly influence the development of mutual cooperation and create interest in it. The search for more effective instruments and methods of management is continuing, and this is a constant, creative process.

The improvement of systems of economic management and their interconnection is an important precondition for developing the CEMA countries' integration. The interest in the collective discussion of these questions and the exchange of experience of socialist economic management, which is becoming increasingly effective and intensive, is therefore understandable. The socialist states, as is well known, do not impose on each other their own practice in building management and organizational relations in the economy. However, the more profound mutual study of this practice and the joint assessment of collective experience help in applying tried and tested general principles of socialist economic management to individual countries' specific features. Additional opportunities are thus opened up for intensifying international production and scientific-technical coordination.

Coordination of Economic Strategy

In speaking of the prospects for mutual cooperation between the CEMA countries in the '80s, I should like to stress that the long-term strategy of economic cooperation elaborated 12 years ago and enshrined in the comprehensive program of integration has given a good account of itself.

It has acquired a further specific form in the long-term programs covering the most important complexes of material production and in bilateral general schemes for specialization. Now, in connection with the pressing requirement for the intensification of economic development, there is an urgent need for new initiatives, and a number of proposals on this score have already been voiced at the recent party congresses. It is primarily a case of intensifying the coordination of economic strategy.

This question is urgent not only for the CEMA countries. The world today, with its global economic and social problems, is experiencing the need for a higher degree of coordination in the economic development of individual states.

Unfortunately, there are many obstacles on this path, primarily the selfish interests of the leading imperialist powers. Nonetheless the leaders of even these powers attempt at their annual conferences to achieve coordination among themselves on a number of questions of economic policy. Anxiety over the critical disorder of the world capitalist economy, world inflation and unemployment explains this search for common denominators in policy.

It is not hard to see, either, why the developing states, which are hit particularly hard by the crisis, are demanding global talks and a collective

strategy to mitigate the world economic contradictions most painful to them. In brief, in the economic sphere as, indeed, in politics, the coordination of the actions and long-term aims of different countries and their international groupings has been put on the agenda of present-day international life.

For the socialist community countries the coordination of their 5-year national economic plans has long been an inalienable part of their collaboration. It enables them not only to expand the mutual exchange of commodities in a planned way but also to link the aims of their development to the necessary degree. The harmonization of national strategies has also been promoted by long-term goal-oriented cooperation programs. But today this is no longer enough. The entry of the majority of CEMA countries into the period of transition to the intensive type of economic growth linked with substantial structural changes makes a higher degree of coordination in their long-term goals and tasks not only desirable but necessary. There is a corresponding need for enrichment of the arsenal of forms and methods of the planned coordination of development. For instance, it is time that it was extended for longer periods than hitherto, to the sphere of structural and scientific-technical policy and capital investments.

Of course, it is still impossible to predict with sufficient accuracy the nature this activity will assume. But it is clear that during this activity we will have to find solutions which will subordinate the international socialist division of labor to a greater degree to the demand for the acceleration of technical progress in all CEMA countries, the improvement of the structure of their production and its all-round intensification, and the task of ensuring the necessary technical and economic independence from the capitalist market for each country and our entire community. It is important to seek the consolidation of real economic advantages for each participant in socialist integration, thereby expanding opportunities for increasing and balancing reciprocal trade turnover.

Much will depend on the revelation of yet unused opportunities for production and scientific-technical coordination in the processing industries, the agro-industrial complex, and the services sphere. The way to this lies through coordination of the strategic economic goals. Without this it is hard to achieve rational, complementary national machine-building, metallurgical and chemical complexes or to eliminate unjustified parallel work in production capacities.

In the sphere of scientific and technical progress, where the main lever for raising economic efficiency lies, there is a need in the '80s and '90s for the countries' potentials to be pooled in greater depth than before and made to complement each other for the sake of concentrating efforts on key salients. The first step toward this is coordination of the strategy for the development of science and technology.

For the '80s the CEMA countries have highlighted a number of priority avenues of scientific and technical progress. They include the automation of production processes on the basis of the use of promising computer equipment facilities, above all microcomputers and minicomputers; the development of program

control systems; the creation of a standardized component basis for electronics equipment; the introduction of robot-manipulators and other means of mechanizing labor-intensive processes; the creation of complexes of powerful equipment for developing fuel and raw material deposits and transporting these materials; the development of machinery and equipment ensuring the economical use of fuel and energy; the modernization of the machine-building pool through highly productive precision equipment; and the creation of comprehensive standardized banks of machinery [ryady] for hydraulics and pneumatics.

It is planned to give these salients preference in individual countries. Here every country will be able, by using the advantages of integration cooperation, to concentrate its scientific and technical potential on those of the above-mentioned priority salients for which it has the best preconditions. The USSR's powerful scientific and technical potential will be the pivot of the projected cooperation plans.

Notwithstanding the substantial development of fundamental research and a big reserve of inventions, our country is interested in using the experimental base and other potential of the CEMA countries to produce models of new equipment, instruments and machinery with a view to the speediest organization of their series production. As is well known, the machine building of a number of European CEMA countries is characterized by the existence of a large number of skilled unspecialized enterprises adapted to the flexible production of highly complex articles. Existing experience of direct contacts along the lines of those between a Soviet scientific research institute or design bureau and GDR combine, for instance, shows that the new equipment is successfully assimilated several times more rapidly.

Because the retention of a wide range in machine building is increasingly burdensome economically, there is enhanced interest in particularizing and specializing the national machine-building complexes within the system of the international socialist division of labor. And this is also a question of coordinating economic policy. As a result of these accords the USSR, for instance, could expand the range of specialized exports of machine-building output, particularly heavy machine-building output, of mass types of machine-building output, household appliances, instruments, electronics, various parts and components and finished manufacturing packages, while our CEMA partners could concentrate still further on the production of types of finished output and assemblies, components, and units advantageous to themselves and to the entire community.

Ensuring the CEMA countries' economic growth is the prevailing situation with respect to fuel and raw material resources requires that the international socialist division of labor be directed toward the all-around reduction of the expenditure of these resources per unit of output and toward ensuring their absolute and relative saving. The main thing is not the absolute buildup of the export of raw material and fuel (the opportunities for this are limited) but the taking of joint steps to save them and prevent losses.

As a result of national and international efforts, a high level of energy supply has been achieved for the CEMA countries.

According to a rough estimate, the per capita consumption of primary energy resources in a number of European CEMA countries in the late '70s exceeded the corresponding average indicator for the four main EEC countries (the FRG, Britain, France and Italy), while for the other fraternal countries it came close to the West European indicators. However, this major energy potential is still not being used efficiently enough. The consumption of primary energy resources per unit of national income in the European CEMA countries is approximately 35 to 40 percent higher than in the EEC countries.

The reduction of the energy-intensiveness and materials-intensiveness of production presupposes both the more economical expenditure of resources and the reduction of their losses and longer-term measures to reorganize national economic structures and rationalize the location of energy-intensive production facilities within the CEMA framework--that is, to restrict their development in countries with inadequate fuel and energy resources.

An increasingly pressing need is being felt for the use of potential integration for the accelerated transition of low-waste and resource-saving manufacturing processes in all sectors of material production. Using the opportunities of cooperation, the CEMA countries can create and expand the production of new materials, replacing natural raw material and scarce metals, and can considerably raise the degree of upgrading [oblagorazhivaniye] reciprocally delivered raw material and semifinished products. All this should obviously be the common course of the CEMA countries' economic policy, and individual national decisions should be well-coordinated with each other.

There are also other fields in which the intensification of the coordination of economic policy has become an urgent matter and promises to produce positive results. For instance, we are talking about the agroindustrial sphere and the production of industrial consumer goods.

Alongside the fuller satisfaction of their domestic requirements for grain, feed and livestock products, many CEMA countries have favorable natural climatic and other prerequisites for increasing exports of agricultural output to the community market.

The same can also be said of the output of the food, food processing and light industries. However, to intensify the international socialist division of labor in these spheres of exceptional social importance the objectives of long-term economic policy must be better coordinated. Agriculture, like, indeed, the fuel and raw materials sector, is extremely capital-intensive. That is why not only a long-term guaranteed sales market but also economic delivery terms creating the necessary interest are essential to intensify its export orientation.

Obviously, one aim of the coordination of national economic strategies should be the expansion of cooperation with those CEMA countries whose economic development level is still not high enough and with the developing states, primarily those of a socialist orientation.

This presupposes rendering technical assistance, including on a collective basis, in developing their export capacities both in agriculture and the extractive industry and in the processing sectors. It is important that socialist economic integration constantly open up for them the prospect of enhancing the efficiency of their national economies and increasing their own sources of accumulation.

Of course, the best proposals for improving the CEMA countries' production structures and effecting more profound coordination between them run the risk of remaining mere good intentions unless they are backed up by the relevant organizational and economic measures.

Those taking part in socialist integration have accumulated valuable experience in coordinating national economic interests with the overall interests of the consolidation of their union of integration. This coordination also includes economic conditions of exchange, in other words, fundamental aims of foreign economic policy like the application of economically substantiated prices in reciprocal trade including, when necessary, preferential and incentive prices, the consolidation of collective currency and the development of its monetary functions, the establishment of realistic exchange rates, guarantees preventing possible losses to individual participants in integration in the event of breaking of contract commitments, and so forth. Thanks to the principles of comradely cooperation and socialist solidarity operating within the CEMA framework, particularly favorable opportunities are opened up here for linking national interests and elaborating joint decisions increasing all countries' material interest in integration measures.

For instance, the further expansion of immediate, direct links between the CEMA countries' enterprises and industrial associations, and the search for the best forms of scientific and technical and economic activity, through the formation of international firms, for example, accord with common interests. Experience in such cooperation is still limited and its economic and legal mechanisms have not been assimilated. However, there is no doubt that by developing effective direct links and creating joint firms it is possible to reveal large-scale reserves for international production specialization and sharing.

It is to be supposed that the socialist states' approach toward businesslike cooperation with the Western countries in the '80s may undergo certain changes under the pressure of circumstances. But the main thing will remain constant --the desire to expand this cooperation on the basis of mutual advantage and mutual respect for interests. The trend toward weakening East-West economic collaboration does not accord with the requirements of the future. The CEMA countries are seeking to oppose it.

Their strategy in economic ties with the West is aimed at increasing the proportion of finished output in their exports. The rationalization of the imports structure can be expected to take place via a reduction in the import of foodstuffs and a number of types of materials and equipment whose production the CEMA countries intend to set up through mutual cooperation. There are weighty arguments in favor of importing, instead of finished equipment,

complete sets of machinery for its production or acquiring the relevant licenses.

It is necessary for the socialist community to strengthen its competitive position on world markets and its independence in resources and technology so that no sanctions or "embargoes" from the imperialist powers can disrupt the reproduction process in key economic sectors. For successful collective resistance to the West's pressure and its differentiated policy with respect to individual socialist states, it is important to act as a single front, to link import policy with the development and assimilation of the production of new equipment within the CEMA framework. On the other hand, the programs for the development of production and scientific and technical cooperation with CEMA must obviously provide for the expansion of effective exports to the Western countries. That is one condition for liquidating debts in freely convertible currencies. These are just a few elements characterizing the strategic orientation of economic building in the socialist community countries in the present decade and beyond. It will take place under conditions of the closer coordination of economic policy on a sufficiently broad spectrum of problems. And it is particularly important to emphasize that the joint solution of urgent problems cannot fail to be accompanied by the consolidation of democratic and internationalist principles in the system of the CEMA countries' economic relationships, by the attentive study of collective experience of economic management, and by the sincere desire to help each other.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

CSO: 1802/13

ARTICLE IN THE JOURNAL 'NOWE DROGI'

AU011500 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 85-88

[Text] The journal NOWE DROGI, a theoretical and political organ of the PZPR Central Committee, has published an article by Jerzy Traszewski, deputy editor in chief of the newspaper TRYBUNA LUDU, under the rubric "Public Awareness and Political Struggle—In the Shadow of Great Manipulations." In this article the author writes, in particular:

In recent years at least three mutually complementary factors have caused distortions in the awareness of a considerable part of Polish society, distortions which are foreign to socialism. The first factor, which has been growing for a long time, is the economic, social, and political crisis which started in the late seventies. The second factor is the activation of anti-socialist groupings which, having penetrated the "Solidarity" links, for the first time acquired the opportunity to act openly in legal organizations. The third factor is the undermining role played by the Western anticomunist centers which have utilized the crisis situation and the rightist views of "Solidarity" leaders for their own ends.

How strong has the opponent's influence on the consciousness of Poles been? Are the traces of this influence still to be seen and felt? To what degree do rightist elements shape the views and positions of citizens? Should these phenomena be taken seriously, or did they just happen?

In searching for answers to these questions we should keep in mind that the 16 dramatic months have not only brought a wave of emotions which have often triumphed over reason and an onslaught of reactionary and antisocialist ideology, but also a polarization of political views.

Discussions and disputes regarding the development of events in Poland after August 1980 are taking place and will undoubtedly continue to do so. At present it is still difficult to answer many questions; therefore, it is necessary to study and profoundly analyze the phenomena which has taken place in Poland.

However, it has been clear from the very beginning that the main dividing line in this conflict has run between the leftist and rightist forces. The

main danger to the Polish socialist state has come from the rightist forces. This is an axiom. Everyone who denies or argues this embarks on a wrong path and must draw wrong conclusions from his evaluations. However, he who disregards the conservative views is also in the wrong.

How did it come to pass, then, that 37 years after the party assumed power in Poland the rightist forces turned out to be so strong? Why have they succeeded in utilizing the mistakes which were made and in guiding the dissatisfaction of the working people? Where are the sources of those processes which began with putting forward demands to create new trade unions and finished with plans to usurp power?

Why did a part of the workers class uncritically submit to the influence of the rightist circles in the leadership of the former "Solidarity"? Why did this process continue for so long and why does a part of society even now fail to realize that had the events continued to develop uncontrolled, this would have led to the destruction of the state and to a national catastrophe?

These are the key questions concerning the essence of the conflict in Poland. The traces of the danger from the rightist forces and the counterrevolutionary threat have far from disappeared. The declaration of martial law and the resolute measures taken by the Military Council for National Salvation, the state authorities, and the security organs have liquidated the threat of a civil war, broken the backbone of the opposition, and sharply restricted its activity. However, the threat from the rightist forces continues to exist, although its spokesmen are now considerably weakened. Cheap optimism and belief in quick success would be harmful. Not all prerequisites for the activity of the rightist forces in the mid-seventies and in particular in 1980-81 have been eliminated. A return to normalcy can only take place as a result of a consciously led, controlled, and wisely programmed process. Further progress in solving economic problems, particularly in alleviating and eliminating the difficulties of everyday life, would undoubtedly be of paramount importance in this process.

In order to grasp the essence of the processes which have taken place in Poland recently, it must be realized that the activity of foreign anticomunist forces was and continues to be an important cause of the dangerous development of events in 1980-81. In recent months this activity has been elevated to a government doctrine in some NATO member states, particularly the United States. The NATO states have not only sympathized with the opposition movement in Poland, but have also provided them with financial and material support, first and foremost through their propaganda campaigns carried out by the diversionist Western radio stations.

The more signs there are that the situation in Poland is stabilizing, the more manifestations there are of normalization and progress in implementing reforms in line with the nature of the system, the cruder is the "psychological war" declared on our country. Its organizers do not even bother to conceal their aims by fancy slogans, as was the case a few years ago; they do not choose words, but bluntly state conditions and attempt to dictate them. With the help of "Radio Free Europe", as well as through official government radio stations such as BBC and "France Inter," appeals to organize conflicts and

illegal groupings could be heard and continue to be heard in the Polish language, instructions for the underground are transmitted and various antigovernment appeals are voiced. The interference of the Western capitalist states in the internal affairs of Poland has reached a level unprecedented in the previous history of foreign relations.

This is a phenomenon unprecedented in recent history. Why does the United States and the anticommunist centers of the West inspired by it attack Poland so nervously and flagrantly? Why does the United States continue its propaganda aggression against our country? Why do they support the opposition groupings, thereby violating the principles formulated, in particular, in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference?

The main aim of the strategy of the capitalist states which became clear in 1980-81 is to renew the process of decay in Poland, organize anarchy, and break the ties uniting the socialist countries. From here it was not far from setting into motion ultranationalist slogans, undermining military alliances, and changing the correlation of forces in Europe which exists as a result of World War II and the postwar developments and which was stated in the agreements signed in Yalta and Potsdam as well as in the agreements between the socialist states and the FRG and in the Final Act of the CSCE.

Thus, it can be said today that the diversion against Poland was a component part of the global strategy of the capitalist states with regard to the socialist world. This time Poland was chosen because it was considered to be the weakest link in the community. This is why from the very beginning the anticommunist centers in the West wanted to create in "Solidarity," which was formed in 1980, a strong center of opposition which would quickly expand its influence among the broad masses involved in this organization and in the main directions of its activity. The entire arsenal of means elaborated and tested in the capitalist states in the course of decades was put to use.

However, the propaganda onslaught against Poland, the "psychological war" which has been waged for a long time, the provocations arranged by the West, and the entire arsenal of other means currently utilized against socialism should not be regarded as individual and independent actions. If I were to answer the question about the roots of the rightist antisocialist danger for Poland, I would say that they lie not only in the country itself but also in the international atmosphere and in the still existing plans to tear Poland away from the community of socialist states. The West continues to regard our country as the link with which the dismantling of socialism in Europe could be started. I think that it is in the consequences of such a policy with regard to Poland that the main sources of the danger lie, and it is from these that the Polish counterrevolutionaries derived and continue to derive their strength. Under present conditions, the internal prerequisites for counterrevolution are so threatening and dangerous that they have become an object of manipulation for the anticommunist centers abroad. Without support from outside, the internal counterrevolutionary forces would not have attempted an attack, knowing that it was without hope.

The introduction of martial law paralyzed first of all the base of the opposition and put an end to the harmful propaganda activity. Prerequisites were created for accelerating the processes of restoring the positions of socialism, including those in the sphere of public awareness.

Meanwhile, one can still sometimes get the impression that these processes are taking place far too slowly. Undoubtedly, in the situation itself, which is on the whole difficult, the difficulties of everyday life and the general weariness resulting from the continuing crisis play their part. However, we cannot neglect the influence exerted both by the effects—which are still far from overcome—of the destructive actions by opposition groupings undertaken before December 1981 and their consequences, which did not manifest themselves solely in the sphere of propaganda. For example, a group has formed within the church which cannot understand the changes taking place in modern Catholicism, which rejects dialogue, comes out in favor of a "crusade," and in a number of cases tries to organize public opinion against socialism.

The situation in certain circles of the intelligentsia—where views and positions are preserved that could be qualified as messianic—continues to give grounds for concern.

The situation among the younger members of the workers class who are workers of the first generation also deserves special mention. This group has not yet formed; it has neither traditions nor experience and it is not connected with the rest of the workers class. In many enterprises, particularly those which are new, the majority of labor collectives are workers of the first generation. Is this not the reason why the demagogic slogans contradictory to the basic interests of the workers class found their way so easily into the demands formulated by workers in 1980 and later: Is it not because many detachments of the Polish workers class are still at the very start of their class path that foreign ideology penetrated into their midst relatively easily and the rightist leaders of "Solidarity" gained their support relatively quickly?

Nowadays, when the backbone of the opposition has been smashed, the success of the struggle against all attempts to revive the rightist and reactionary trends is being decided by the political and ideological activity of the party and by the growth of the party's influence on society. Subsequent to the stormy events in the country 18 months ago and later, the PZPR is experiencing a gradually expanding process of reverting to the Leninist norms of internal party life.

In conclusion Je. Kraszewski writes: Today the success of the struggle against the attempts to revive the rightist trends depends on the political activity of the party, on enhancing its influence on social awareness, and on shaping the citizen's views. To attain this goal it will be necessary, above all, to arrive at ideological uniformity in party work. The absence of ideological perspectives poses the danger of losing sight of one's goals and the paths leading to them. The danger consists in the fact that, in the long run, the elimination of ideology from all criteris may lead to the "purification"

of policy from all traits of socialism. The glossing over and the elimination of the dividing lines in ideology could result in reviving opportunist trends within the party and make it easier for the rightist and counterrevolutionary forces coming from without to penetrate the party.

There should be no mistake in identifying the fronts of the struggle; one must see the opponent in those places where he is most dangerous, namely from the right. The experience amassed between August 1980 and December 1981 brutally reminds us of all this. The antisocialist opposition in Poland is not a myth; it really exists and it does not abandon its plans. Its main goal is to undermine socialism in our country, tear Poland away from the socialist community, and tear asunder the alliance with the USSR. This must be kept in mind even today, when the direct threat of counterrevolution has been eliminated.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

CSO: 1802/13

INVINCIBLE FORCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 89-98

[Article by Yu. Zhukov, chairman, Soviet Peace Committee]

[Text] More than ever before the nations are emerging on the proscenium of history today. They have earned the right to vote, which no one can suppress. Through energetic and purposeful actions they can lift the threat of nuclear war and safeguard peace and, therefore, life on our planet.

Yu. V. Andropov, from his speech at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum

A powerful national movement for peace is like an ocean tide. The more violent the political storm which threatens us with war becomes, the higher its powerful waves rise. The senior generation remembers at least three such waves. The first rolled over the globe at the beginning of the 1950s, when the movement was joined by half a billion people, who signed the famous Stockholm appeal for banning atomic weapons. They helped to defeat General MacArthur's and his supporters' intention of dropping an atom bomb on the Korean People's Democratic Republic. The 1960s saw a new wave of demonstrations, meetings, petitions and protests which actively assisted the victory of the Vietnamese people over the American aggressors, who were forced to retreat in shame. The third wave of mass actions on the part of the supporters of peace rose in the 1970s, in the course of which some 700 million signatures were collected under the second Stockholm appeal, forcing Carter, then the U.S. president, to cool off his militancy, as reflected in the rejection of his intention of deploying in Europe a truly devilish weapon--the neutron bomb.

Now, in the 1980s, when reactionary forces are in power in the United States and are challenging all mankind and accelerating beyond all limits the race of the most dangerous arms, a fourth wave of national protests, the most powerful in the entire history of antiwar movements, is rising.

We Do Not Beg for Peace--We Fight for It!

I remember the exciting day of 20 April 1949, when the first World Peace Congress gathered in Pleyel Hall, in Paris. These were ugly times. At that

time we were as yet unfamiliar with the strictly secret Directive No 20/1 of Truman's National Security Council, which clearly stipulated that the objective of the United States is to overthrow the Soviet system. However, the treaty on the creation of a North Atlantic Military Alliance, which had recently been initialed in Washington, left no doubt that its participants were charting a course toward preparations for a new world war with a view to strangling communism, something of which Churchill had dreamed 65 years previously.

At that time people with a clear conscience, who heatedly opposed the aggressive imperialist plans, had gathered in Paris and Prague (where those to whom the then "cold war crusaders" had refused French entry visas), to discuss what had to be done to stop the madmen who were practicing brinkmanship. The congress was attended by representatives of 72 countries. They included a great variety of people, such as Joliot-Curie, the head of the French Nuclear Energy Commissariat, Robeson, the famous American singer, Bernal, the noted British scientist, Neruda, the great Chilean poet, Kosmodem'yanskaya, the Russian teacher and mother of Zoya, the heroine, who had been tortured by the fascists, Mulk Raj Anand, the Indian writer, and Picasso, the famous Spanish painter. The participants in that congress spoke for 600 million people.

I shall never forget the exciting moment when Joliot-Curie proclaimed from the rostrum of the congress: "We have gathered here not to beg the war-mongers for peace but to force them to accept it."

Yielding to Washington's pressure, the French government removed Joliot-Curie from his governmental position. Naturally, it thus harmed French science but was unable to stop the peace movement. The movement grew tempestuously and its activities assumed an increasingly widespread nature. The slogan proclaimed by Joliot-Curie became popular throughout the world. The peace movement quickly became an influential international force. The World Peace Council was elected at the Second Peace Congress in Warsaw, in 1950. Under the chairmanship of Joliot-Curie, followed by Bernal and, today, R. Chandra, the noted Indian social and political leader, the council became an international center for the organization of the fighters for peace in many countries.

In the 34 years since our first congress, a time which abounded in dangerous political crises and local wars, we were nevertheless able to preserve peace throughout the world. Mankind owes this fact to the peace movement, which has mobilized and is leading in the struggle against the threat of war hundreds of millions of peoples of all possible political convictions or religious beliefs.

Our Mass Actions

The Soviet peace movement is actively participating in this struggle. Let me cite a few figures which speak a great deal. Here is what was accomplished in 1982 alone:

In May-June more than 20,000 demonstrations and meetings, involving more than 60 million people, were held in favor of the adoption of effective decisions at the Second Special UN General Assembly Disarmament Session;

In July-August, when the international Stockholm-Minsk and Moscow-Kiev-Budapest-Bratislava-Vienna marches passed through Soviet territory, about 700,000 Soviet people met with the foreign participants in the marches;

In October, during the Mass Disarmament Action Week, more than 80,000 meetings, marches and various demonstrations took place, with the participation of some 50 million people;

More than 12 million participants in such measures signed an address to the United Nations demanding an end to the arms race, presented to J. Perez de Cuellar, United Nations secretary general, and distributed as an official document at the 37th General Assembly;

More than 15 million Soviet boys and girls sent their protests against preparations for a nuclear war to NATO headquarters in Brussels.

H. (Binnendike), deputy director of the staff of the U.S. Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, who had come to Moscow to collect data for the hearings of the Committee on the Question of American-Soviet Relations, was amazed when we recently gave him those figures, for the American press had written not a word on the mass actions of the Soviet peace fighters, while the U.S. President dared to proclaim from the rostrum of the Second UN General Assembly Special Session that the struggle for peace was forbidden in the USSR. We assume that the President's aides had clearly not bothered to inform him that what is banned in the Soviet Union is not the struggle for peace but the propaganda of war which, furthermore, is forbidden by the constitution. We had to inform the American guest about the real situation and give him a thick pack of photographs showing our street demonstrations, meetings and collection of signatures under the disarmament petition submitted to the United Nations. I do not know whether he checked the facts personally. In any case, it would have been difficult to think, when presented with these facts, that the Soviet people are not fighting for peace from fear of "detention." Nor do I know whether these photographs were passed on to the members of the Senate committee at the hearings.

This year, 120 republic, kray, oblast and city committees for the defense of peace are operating in our country, organizing and intending to carry out, as reported to us, even larger mass actions. The importance of this campaign in the struggle for peace will be enhanced by the fact that the presidium of the Soviet Peace Committee has passed a resolution that it be held within the framework of the World Disarmament Campaign, which was proclaimed at the 37th UN General Assembly. Last March, during the Moscow visit by the UN secretary general, we promised him regularly to inform the United Nations on the way Soviet nongovernmental organizations, the Soviet Peace Committee above all, will be waging this campaign and to report on our mass actions at the next General Assembly session.

Unprecedented Upsurge

The current wave of antiwar actions throughout the world is truly unprecedented.

Let us give the example of the development of the antiwar struggle in the United States. The American supporters of peace have gained substantial experience in mass actions, beginning with the 1960s, when they began, for the first time, to organize huge demonstrations and meetings calling for an end to the "dirty war" in Indochina, actions which were, furthermore, profoundly dramatic. Let us recall an action by veterans of the "dirty war" in Vietnam: they tore from their chests their medals earned for combat actions, standing on the steps of the Capitol and at the gates of the White House. Let us recall the excited debates on the campuses of the largest American universities, in the course of which the young people called for an end to the aggression. Let us recall the truly fierce antiwar demonstrations in many U.S. cities.

A certain calm prevailed in the 1970s. The war in Vietnam had ended. Important American-Soviet accords and treaties had been signed. The period of detente had begun and the people had sighed with relief. Then, once again, the winds of the "cold war" began to blow, the threat of another round in the nuclear arms race appeared, hotbeds of war broke out in Lebanon and other parts of the world and the Reagan administration began to send its notorious "military advisers" abroad in increasing numbers. A period of a new tempestuous upsurge of the antiwar struggle opened, the scale of which can be clearly imagined by last year's million-strong demonstration in New York, in which for an entire day supporters of the peace took over the streets and squares of the huge city.

The antiwar struggle in the United States is currently becoming increasingly dynamic. Not so long ago, our central television showed a touching event in that struggle: young American men and women lay on railroad tracks to block a long train of blindingly white freight cars transporting nuclear weapons from plants to navy ships. The police beat up the daring demonstrators and threw them out of the way. Again and again, however, they threw themselves across the tracks.

These pictures reminded us of the exploit of the Raymonde Dien, the young Frenchwoman who also threw herself across the tracks blocking a military train carrying weapons for the French army of occupation which was then waging a shameless colonial war in Vietnam at the beginning of the 1950s. We recalled the French seaman Henri Martin who, back from Vietnam, distributed leaflets among the workers at the Toulon arsenal, appealing to them to refuse to make weapons for the "dirty war." We recalled the longshoremen in Nice, who sank in the sea a rocket-launching system which was being shipped to Algeria. All of these participants in the active antiwar struggle were sent to jail. Subsequently, however, under the pressure of the powerful peace movement, they were released. The actions of these daring fighters greatly contributed to the fact that the French government signed the Geneva 1954 agreements on ending the war in Vietnam and which, in 1962, was forced to stop the war in Algeria as well...

Today the peace movement faces on a priority basis not one local problem or another but above all a global problem: the prevention of a nuclear war, the threat of which is hanging over all mankind. It is entirely natural that a sharp struggle is being waged today in the main center of truly criminal preparations for nuclear war--the United States.

The Struggle for 'Freezing' Nuclear Armaments

Today the campaign for a nuclear "freeze" has become most widespread overseas. It is headed by a broad coalition of antiwar, religious, women's and other public organizations. Its slogan is "Freeze the Testing, Production and Deployment of Nuclear Arms and Means of Delivery." It would be absolutely accurate to say that today, although holding a variety of views, most Americans, including hundreds of thousands of people who were not supporters of antiwar actions previously, are in favor of such a "freeze."

The recent participation in this movement of many wealthy and conservative people, who voted for Reagan in 1980 and are still supporting him on some matters, is a new feature of the movement. Another new feature is the growing participation in the struggle for a "freeze" of clergymen, including Catholic bishops who, despite the strongest possible pressure exerted by the White House, declared that a nuclear war is immoral. Not so long ago, in its 29 March issue, the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, an influential American newspaper, wrote that "the National Council of Christian Churches ... and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops considered ... that churches must warn their parishioners that a nuclear war is fraught with potential catastrophe." Such a stance assumed by a number of church personalities is explained, naturally, not only by their realizing the importance and urgency of the disarmament struggle but that they must take into consideration the fears of religious Americans whose donations support their churches. This was frankly said in Moscow by the most popular evangelical preacher Billy Graham, who organizes services in stadiums, attended by tens of thousands of people, and who participated in the world conference of religious leaders opposing the nuclear threat. "My ministry," he told me, "is in favor of banning nuclear weapons and I must follow it." However, the matter does not rest there and no one ignores the concern which the words and actions of the "war hawks" trigger in such people.

Finally, we cannot ignore the fact that most noted American personalities, former holders of key government positions, such as former secretaries of state Muskie, Vance, and even, from time to time, Rusk, former defense secretaries MacNamara and Brown, former White House adviser Bundy and many senators and congressmen, are increasingly in favor of putting an end to the arms race. By majority vote the U.S. House of Representatives passed a resolution calling for lowering the pace of increase in military expenditures with the new fiscal year which begins on 1 October, for the congressmen will have to face their electorate as early as 1984.

The fact that two former directors of the Arms and Disarmament Control Agency--J. Smith, who headed the U.S. delegation in the SALT I talks in 1972, and P. Warnke, who participated in drafting the SALT II treaty, also oppose

the position held by the Reagan cabinet. Naturally, the broad public trusts them more than petty politicians who are trying to prove that it would be dangerous to U.S. security to engage in realistic talks with the "Reds," and, therefore, undesirable, for they are specialists who are perfectly familiar with all details involved in discussions with the USSR.

Finally, let us not ignore the fact that most noted American and other scientists are becoming increasingly active in the struggle against the arms race. Here is a fact: the regular International Conference of Scientists for Peace -- a movement which began a quarter of a century ago at the Pugwash estate in Canada, which belonged to the now-deceased American millionaire Eaton, who supported the struggle for disarmament, was held in Warsaw last August. At the conference the participants adopted and published a declaration in which, after emphasizing the danger presented by the current situation triggered by the arms race, they appealed to 11 scientists in the world "to realize their responsibility and directly to join the struggle for the prevention of a nuclear war." The appeal was sent to the most noted world scientists with the request to sign it if they agreed. What happened? Favorable responses poured back and the authors of the declaration were joined, among others, by more than 100 recipients of the Nobel Prize for Science, including physicist H. Bethe, one of the creators of the first atom bomb.

Some Interesting Debates in the House of Lords

Here is another interesting example of the growing prestige of the peace movement. Last year a delegation of representatives of antiwar organizations in Great Britain came to Moscow. They included Lord F. Brockway, chairman of the World Disarmament Movement. A joint declaration regarding the struggle for disarmament was drafted as a result of the talks held between the members of the delegation and the leaders of our Committee for the Defense of Peace. The declaration was put on the agenda for debates in the House of Lords on 16 February 1983.

Lord Brockway reported on the results of his talks with the Soviet Peace Committee, emphasizing that the meeting was constructive and that the joint declaration drafted in Moscow could and should become the basis for practical cooperation between public organizations in Great Britain and the USSR. "I assume," said Lord Bishopston in the course of the debates, "that the overwhelming majority of the 14 points of the declaration would be acceptable to the majority present here today as it would be to other people who would like to be free from the fear caused by nuclear arms." In reference to the activities of the current British government against the peace movement, he said: "Those who are identified with peace movements are being undeservedly defamed and abused. Naturally, all of us are part of the great movement for peace, for we are aspiring to reach the same objectives. Be that as it may, it is unquestionable that the interest in and concern for nuclear matters are growing with every passing day." Lord Jenkins, another speaker, said that "it seems to me that although the (British) government claims from time to time to be engaged in the search for peace, the actual impression is that it is far more actively trying to create a climate of war.... To this effect history is being rewritten and parity in conventional and nuclear weapons is

presented in a grossly distorted shape.... We cannot secure peace if we act as though war is imminent and name the Soviet Union as the enemy, as ministers are beginning to do...."

The struggle against the nuclear threat has assumed the widest possible scope in the FRG, whose people are realizing with increasing clarity that they will inevitably be faced with the threat of annihilation if the authorities, ignoring the will of the majority of the West German population, were to deploy in the country new American missiles targeted on the USSR and the other socialist countries.

Naturally, the reader will remember the repeatedly televised reports of police dealings with British women who, for months on end, have kept in a state of siege the military base in Greenham-Common, where the British government intends to place the American missiles. These women have been beaten, dragged into the mud by their ankles and thrown in jail. Again and again, however, they have returned to the base, demonstrating their high militant spirit and their resolve.

The same resolve imbued the long protest march of the Italian peace fighters from Milan to the Comiso site in Sicily, another place in which NATO intends to position its missiles targeted on the USSR. The same resolve is manifested by the Japanese fighters for peace, who are fearlessly withstanding the attacks of the police equipped with the latest crowd control means, when they protest the docking of American nuclear aircraft carriers and submarines in Japanese ports.

Increasingly, new forces are joining the struggle against the threat of a new world war. This process of tempestuous expansion of antiwar movements is varied in nature. It combines a great variety of politically and ideologically different forces motivated by the common desire to prevent a third world war which, given the current mass destruction weapons--nuclear and chemical above all--could end in a catastrophe which could destroy all life on earth.

On the Eve of the Prague Assembly

One of the most important tasks today is to ensure the coordination and interaction among all peace-loving forces, which are beginning to understand more and more profoundly as time goes on the simple truth of today: if you want to survive you must struggle, ignoring all political and ideological differences, you must struggle together with all people of good will for the salvation of our common home--the earth--for the prevention of war, strengthening peace and security, ending armaments and promoting disarmament.

A number of international and national nongovernmental organizations have called for holding a meeting of representatives of mass antiwar movements and organizations the world over for a dialogue on topical problems of war and peace in 1983. A meeting of representatives of 30 international nongovernmental organizations and mass antiwar movements in more than 80 countries was held in Lisbon in 1982. The decision was made to hold a world assembly "For

Peace and Life and Against Nuclear War." The assembly will open in Prague on 21 June.

Practical preparations for it began in Geneva, where a meeting of a work group of the International Preparatory Committee, in its expanded membership, met on 18-19 February. Representatives of 71 international and national non-governmental organizations participated in its work. Extensively represented, among others, were organizations such as the International League of Women for Peace and Freedom, the World Peace Council, the World Council of Churches, the International Peace Bureau, the International Democratic Federation of Women, the World Consultative Council of Friends Serving Society (Quakers), the "Nuclear Freeze Campaign" (United States), the "Women for Peace" FRG and Netherland organizations, the World Federation of Associations for the United Nations, and many others. An appeal to the assembly and procedural rules were adopted, emphasizing that "the assembly will be open to representatives of national, regional and international organizations, groups and institutions and individuals who share the common wish to find a way to cooperate on any or all problems on the agenda regardless of differences in views and approaches to individual matters." A draft assembly agenda was also adopted, drafted in such a way that anyone could participate in an open and purposeful dialogue. Eleven major dialogues will be held within the framework of the assembly on basic problems of contemporary anti-war movements. Furthermore, numerous meetings among young people, women, physicians, scientists, lawyers and journalists will be held.

Let us also emphasize that currently close cooperation is being established between nongovernmental organizations fighting for a reduction in armaments and United Nations agencies. This proves the growing reputation of the antiwar movements. Let me recall that during the Second Special UN General Assembly Disarmament Session the floor was granted to more than 80 members of international and national nongovernmental organizations, who submitted their proposals. The resolution which was passed by the 37th UN General Assembly on holding a world disarmament campaign offered new opportunities for the further development of cooperation among nongovernmental organizations and the United Nations. The Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, which already has established working contact with the UN Secretariat, intends to carry out all of its major activities in 1983 within the framework of this campaign.

Concern in Washington and in NATO Headquarters

All of this is causing a growing concern in the imperialist camp. The time is past when they could afford to ignore the antiwar movement on the assumption that through a conspiracy of silence by the information media they own they would suppress the struggle waged by the people. Today the reactionary militaristic forces have converted to the use of more aggressive means.

For the past 2 years the U.S. and NATO leaders have waged an open struggle against antiwar movements. Open "psychological warfare" is being waged against the supporters of peace. The first to be used was the rusty weapon of base slander: anyone who was against the arms race was labeled an

"agent of Moscow," and his activities were described as "subversive." However, Washington soon realized that this was not working. Threats and repressive measures followed.

NATO Secretary General Luns addressed the association of journalists accredited to international organizations in Geneva on 31 March. He was asked if he believed that the Western European governments "would be able to surmount the antiwar movements." Luns gave a hesitant "yes," and immediately plunged into a long discourse in an effort to frighten the representatives of the press with assumed fears of the allegedly terrible consequences were the governments to be defeated in their struggle against the supporters of peace who opposed the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe. "If such movements," he expatiated, "were to gain the upper hand while parliaments and governments were accepting the deployment of the missiles, the result would be chaos (?!), at which point democracy, as we understand it, would be threatened most seriously. If you allow the man on the street (!) to take over you would find yourself in trouble."

The headquarters of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc is seriously concerned with the actions of the "men on the street," as Luns described the participants in antiwar movements, whose numbers are increasingly steadily. Obviously, this is the reason for which the U.S. and NATO "psychological warfare" services are increasingly using another variant in the struggle against the antiwar movements, presenting matters as though Reagan had drastically changed his attitude toward supporters of peace in Western countries, who are allegedly misguided and are choosing the dangerous path of cooperation with their partners in the USSR and the other socialist countries.

Reagan himself is changing the tone of his speeches. With increasing frequency he is assuring those who would listen to him that his administration, by imposing on the United States and its NATO allies a frenzied arms race, is guided exclusively by "concern" for peace, since allegedly military superiority of the North Atlantic bloc members alone could restrain the USSR and its allies from an attack on the "democratic West." Such coarse propaganda fabrications, however, could mislead only those who want to be misled. As the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR wrote in its 28 March issue, such fabrications "make no impression on the European peace movement. The movement is even planning to double its efforts in the struggle against NATO strategy in 1983.... The peace fighters leave no doubt that their objective remains the elimination of all missiles, whether cruise or Pershing."

In his efforts to lower the tension of the activities of the supporters of peace against the deployment of such missiles in Europe, pretending that he holds a sensible and even conciliatory position, Reagan formulated some sort of "intermediary option," according to which the United States would allegedly be ready to deploy in Western Europe a somewhat smaller number of missiles than previously planned. This maneuver, however, which pursued the same old goal of leading the Geneva talks into a dead end and of starting the deployment of new missiles in Europe, was immediately exposed. The Soviet assessment of Reagan's new proposals as being aimed at disorienting the supporters of the termination of the nuclear arms race, is entirely shared by the peace organizations.

Subversive Maneuvers

In their efforts at least to weaken the front of the enemies of the nuclear arms race, the U.S. and NATO "psychological warfare" services are doing everything possible to split the ranks of the supporters of peace and to set against the Soviet Union those among them who respond to the propaganda. Such subversive activities are most actively taking place today in Great Britain. As the American magazine NEWSWEEK recently wrote, "Margaret Thatcher has declared war once again, this time against the antinuclear movement which is growing throughout Great Britain, and which calls for a rejection of all types of nuclear weapons." The British weekly THE NEW STATESMAN published interesting details of the campaign against the supporters of peace at a conference of the Young Conservatives Organization: "Today coordination groups have been created on three different levels, each one of which is headed by a noted conservative political personality. One such group, the activities of which are familiar to very few people, is headed by the prime minister herself."

Little puppet groups have been put together under misleading labels such as "Coalition for Peace From the Positions of Security," "Committee for Struggle for a Free World," "Peace with NATO Help," and others. They are financed quite generously. They are printing and distributing their publications, financed by the extreme-right American "Hetheridge Foundation." The "Committee for Struggle for a Free World" alone received this fiscal year from the British Foreign Office 44,000 pounds sterling and is now calling for a "subsidy" of as much as 110,000.

Also noteworthy is the fact that the ranks of some antiwar movements have been penetrated by people whose purpose is to prevent their unification and organization of a purposeful struggle for putting an end to the arms race and to redirect such movements toward the struggle against the USSR and the other socialist countries. What was the purpose, for example, of the extensive article by one E. Thompson, who claims to be the ideologue of the "Movement for Nuclear Disarmament," who published a sort of manifesto in the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN, in its 21 February issue? What is the main idea promoted in the article? The author calls upon the fighters for peace to consider what would happen should the struggle against the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe win. In that case, he writes, "the modernizing of NATO would come to an end as a result of the activities of Western European nations; the American delegation to the talks in Geneva would lose the ground under its feet, while the Soviet Union would...rise over the defeated NATO." In his aspiration to turn the British supporters of peace against cooperation with the Soviet peace fighters, the author repeats verbatim the most disgusting fabrications of the American and British "psychological warfare" services concerning our country, our system and our people. He even sees in Soviet politics "symptoms of paranoia," allegedly caused by the tremendous losses suffered by the Soviet people in the battle against fascism. It is true that disgusting attacks on our people such as those launched by this "ideologue," who claims the role of leader of "new" antiwar movements in Western Europe, are rarely found even in the most anti-Soviet Western newspapers. Considering this, what is the worth of hypocritical claims to the effect that he and his like-minded supporters favor a nuclear-free Europe?

Naturally, the Soviet fighters for peace have no use for gentlemen such as Thompson. However, this makes it even more important today to do everything possible to strengthen our efficient and equal cooperation with all antiwar movements which favor not in words but in action the removal of all nuclear weapons from Europe, freezing American and Soviet nuclear arms and putting an end to the arms race as a whole.

We are also ready to cooperate with Western antiwar movements even if major political and ideological differences were to arise between us. All that is required is a strict observance of the principles of nonintervention in domestic affairs. We do not dictate our will to our partners in the noble struggle for peace. We do not impose upon them our own political views or expect of them the same. If this rule is observed strictly, the success of joint or even parallel actions is certain. That is why to the question of whether we should march together with, or separately from, all antiwar movements on earth we unconditionally answer: only together!

I am looking at two telegrams from two points on earth quite distant from each other.

In the course of a Soviet-American meeting of supporters of peace in Tashkent, a prestigious delegation from Seattle (United States), headed by a representative of the mayor and a bishop, and the Uzbek peace workers, unanimously took an oath the text of which was suggested by the Americans and signed by 40,000 residents of that American city: "The populations of Seattle and Tashkent, sister cities, are united in their love for their cities and mutual hopes for a happy future for their children. We realize that should a nuclear war break out all that is precious to us would be destroyed We swear to do everything possible to prevent a nuclear war. A nuclear war is an unimaginable catastrophe against which we must fight. Our peoples must act jointly to find peaceful ways to resolve differences and be free from the threat of war. We are striving toward these goals and would like to see other nations engaged in similar activities in their own countries to join us."

The second telegram, which comes from Dusseldorf (FRG) reports that miners and members of trade union councils and trade union personalities in the Ruhr area have studied the appeal of the Soviet workers at the Chelyuskintsy Mine in Donetsk, and that they are intensifying their struggle against the nuclear threat. They have resolved to hold a "Ruhr-83" peace march from Duisburg to Dortmund during the 3-day Easter holiday. On the initiative of the committees for peace and the social democratic and communist factions, the municipalities of Dortmund, Duisburg, Oberhausen and Marl resolved to proclaim the territory of their cities nuclear-free zones.

Four million FRG citizens have already signed the famous Krefeld appeal, which calls for preventing the deployment of new American missiles on West German soil, and the collection of signatures is continuing. According to reports, more than 50 social democratic deputies in the Bundestag oppose the deployment of new American missiles on FRG territory. This is merely one example of the unprecedented struggle for peace which is now developing on all continents.

Let Weinberger, the U.S. secretary of defense, who is one of the fiercest opponents of the peace movement, continue to claim that this movement is organized and guided by clever Soviet agents and their "figurehead organizations," and let President Reagan continue to claim that the struggle for peace is forbidden in the USSR and the other socialist countries. Let them! These political leaders of contemporary America are merely demonstrating thus the amazing primitive and false nature of their propaganda. Joliot-Curie's immortal words of 20 April 1949 are an annihilating answer to their fabrications: "Truth does not need a travel visa. No one has ever been able to stop it. It will go everywhere and will pull down the masks of the warmongers. It will lead the men and women the world over to unite to block the path of war."

Peace will defeat war!

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/13

NONALIGNED MOVEMENT AT AN IMPORTANT STAGE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 99-110

[Article by Yu. Alimov]

[Text] The Seventh Conference of Heads of States in Government of Nonaligned Countries, which was held in New Delhi, was one of the most important international events of the year, which will unquestionably have an impact on the world situation. It was natural and legitimate for it to become the focal point of the close attention paid by governments and public opinion and for its results to continue to be of great interest and major political significance.

The nonaligned movement has long earned the right to be considered an important factor in global politics. In interacting with other progressive forces in the struggle for peaceful coexistence and for the complete and comprehensive decolonizing of countries and nations in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania, for more than 20 years it has been making a useful contribution to international life. This was confirmed at the New Delhi conference as well, which was held during an alarming and important period, when the hegemonic ambitions and aggressiveness of U.S. imperialism have once again brought to life the ghost of the cold war on a global scale, while the liberated countries have found themselves plunged into a most severe economic crisis experienced by the capitalist world.

It is no secret that under such circumstances some fears arose even among the participants in the nonaligned movement on the eve of the conference, concerning its outcome, the more so since the West mounted a concentrated political, economic and propaganda pressure on many nonaligned countries, asking them to refuse to confront imperialism and neocolonialism or adopt an active position on the problems of war and peace and the pitting of the entire movement against the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity. However, the proceeding and results of the New Delhi encounter refuted such Western hopes. Nearly two-thirds of all countries, which attended this summit meeting, reasserted the high antiwar and anti-imperialist potential of nonalignment policy and movement.

I

If we were to look for the "social origin" of the nonaligned movement--which was born of the vital realities of our age--we would inevitably find that it

was based on the general crisis of capitalism, the successful development of the national liberation movement, the breakdown of colonial empires and the establishment of numerous independent countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Under the conditions of the confrontation between countries belonging to the two opposite social systems, from the very beginning the liberated countries realized the possibility of relying on the extensive support of the Soviet Union and the other countries which have taken the path of building socialism and on the changed ratio of forces in the world arena, in favor of the nations. Unquestionably, this circumstance played a major role in the choice and consolidation of the foreign policy course of nonalignment with military alliances and groups of our time which, as we know, was violently opposed by imperialism.

We know that the development of nonalignment was both "horizontal" and "vertical," i.e., it followed the line of extending the policy of nonalignment to ever new countries and that of the organizational establishment and development of an international association of nonaligned countries. Today the nonaligned movement has 101 full members, including two national liberation organizations--the PLO and SWAPO--and the movement itself, after it was joined by the Republic of Vanuatu in 1983, was extended to Oceania for the first time.

It is no secret that such a broad international association is a rather heterogeneous conglomerate in terms of its ideological, socioeconomic and political characteristics. It includes republics, monarchies, socialist countries (Vietnam, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Cuba, Laos and Yugoslavia), countries with a socialist orientation and countries in which capitalist relations have been established. It is entirely clear that there could not even be a question of any type of class or sociopolitical community in this case. Nevertheless, the nonaligned movement, as the 21 years of its life have confirmed, has a sufficiently stable base for its development in the similarity in the historical fates, conditions and main international tasks of its members. As all their meetings have confirmed, in the final account the unity of interests of the nonaligned countries along basic strategic directions is prevailing over arguments and differences.

From the very beginning, the countries united within the movement focused their common attention on three main directions, i.e., the struggle for peace, the struggle for the elimination of all colonialist and racist hotbeds, the strengthening of their political independence and economic development and the democratization of international relations. Along each one of these directions, nonalignment with military-political alliances proved to be actually directed above all toward a "nonalignment" with the aggressive exploitative policies of the imperialist countries.

A specific historical approach to the development of the movement clearly shows the way time has shifted the emphasis in its very nature and practical activities. Along with changes in the initial circumstances under which it appeared, gradually the importance of two directions (peace and development) was enhanced even further, while the third (elimination of hotbeds of colonialism and racism) gradually lost its global nature as colonial empires became

a thing of the past. Today this task is related above all to the liberation of the southern part of Africa and a number of small territories and the rebuff of expansionistic Zionist actions in the Middle East which, naturally, does not make it any less relevant.

By the end of the 1970s two main objective circumstances began to define the main feature of the movement's policies and activities: the extreme aggravation of international relations, caused by imperialism, U.S. imperialism above all, threatening the world with a nuclear missile catastrophe, and the drastic worsening of the economic situation of the liberated countries.

In their time, it was precisely the understanding of the dangerous consequences of a fratricidal arms race and a global military confrontation and of the common interests of the nonaligned countries in organizing peaceful coexistence that were among the main reasons for their unification. From the very beginning this unification proved itself an antiwar international force, steadily and actively promoting detente, an end to the arms race and peaceful settlement of disputes and conflicts among countries. All subsequent Western misrepresentations about some kind of different "initial phase" of the movement notwithstanding, the opponent of the peace-loving aspirations of the nonaligned countries, represented by imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, and the determination of the anti-imperialist direction in the political course followed by the nonaligned movement in the world arena, were accurately defined at the first and second conferences held, respectively, in 1961 and 1964.

Today the nonaligned movement, which was born under the circumstances of the cold war in the 1960s and which strengthened during the period of the warming of the international climate in the 1970s, is once again experiencing an atmosphere of sharp "drop in temperature." Naturally, increased U.S. aggressiveness throughout the world, the tension in Soviet-American relations and the aggravation of the conflicts fanned by imperialism and its partners in the Middle East, southern Africa, the South Atlantic, Central America and the Caribbean, could not fail to affect the position held by the nonaligned countries. What worsens the situation even further as far as the nonaligned countries are concerned is the fact that some of them (Iran and Iraq) have been waging a protracted internecine war or have been on the brink of war with each other (Ethiopia-Somali); crisis situations have either been incited or have broken out (the situation in Southeast Asia, with Afghanistan, Western Sahara, Chad); difficulties are being experienced by the Organization of African Unity, the Arab League and the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC).

On the economic side, suffice it to say that never before have difficulties in economic development and the burden of foreign indebtedness of the liberated countries been so heavy and exerted such pressure on their policies as today. Remaining linked to the capitalist global economic system, the economies of most of them are suffering from the latter's diseases in an even more acute form than the developed capitalist countries; they are suffering from the profound economic crisis which has spread over the capitalist world.

Over the past 30 years the neocolonialist countries and monopolies have extracted from the young national states in their capacity as "partners" more actual values than the former mother countries had taken out of their colonies over the preceding 300 years. Furthermore, the United States, the EEC and Japan have erected artificial barriers in their trade with the developing countries, pursuing a rigid protectionist policy toward their goods. In the international financial organizations, which are controlled by monopoly capital, the young countries have remained virtually rightless in terms of decision-making. Among the capitalist predators U.S. monopoly capital stands out for its particular greed and "omnivorousness." Its objective is to set up its own neocolonial empire on the ruins of the colonial empires of its NATO allies.

As a result, the catastrophic situation of the developing countries has currently worsened to the breaking point. As was pointed out at the conference in New Delhi, for the first time after their national liberation, many developing countries have shown a decrease in their per capita GNP in real figures. The prices of their main raw materials have reached their lowest point in 50 years. The balance of payments deficits of the liberated countries and their indebtedness have doubled since 1979, equaling, respectively, \$100 and \$600 billion. One-half of these amounts is owed to private financial institutions in the Western countries, which extend loans under particularly extortionary and usurious conditions. Essentially, therefore, the circumstances have faced the nonaligned countries with the urgent need to react to the drastic aggravation of the political and economic situation in the world and to face changes in their own situation.

II

Against the background of considerable changes in objective international conditions, Western policy toward the nonaligned countries today as well appears similar to the old familiar combination of "carrot and stick" used by the colonizers. On the eve of the New Delhi conference the United States and other imperialist countries tried, furthermore, to make use of the aggravated international tension and difficult economic situation of the liberated countries for the sake of maximally influencing decisions. The objective of all Western efforts were clear for all to see: to blunt the anti-imperialist trend at the conference and in the further activities of the nonaligned movement.

The West used all available means and methods in the offensive it mounted against the positions of the nonaligned countries and their associations. Some countries (Cuba, Nicaragua, Libya and others) were threatened with the use of force; economic pressure was applied on many others, while subversive operations were carried out in yet other countries (including India). Efforts were made to use the heterogenous nature of the movement, its internal conflicts and differences on problems such as the Iran-Iraq conflict, the situation in Western Sahara and Chad, and so on. Particular efforts were made to draw the attention of the nonaligned countries and their conference away from the main international problems and to turn it to artificially created problems of the so-called "Afghan" and "Kampuchean" variety.

For more than 3 years Washington and the other NATO capitals have aimed their propaganda fire at Cuba and at Fidel Castro personally, who was chairman of the nonaligned movement during that period, and at the anti-imperialist decisions which were passed at the last conference of nonaligned countries in Havana. Cuba was accused of everything possible: alleged violation of the principles of nonalignment, the desire to impose upon the nonaligned movement a "pro-Soviet" course and attempts to divide the movement. The West openly hoped that as the chairmanship would be passed on from Cuba to India the movement would switch to positions of seemly moderation in its assessments of the international situation and its demands.

However, the subversive anti-Cuban campaign crashed noisily. The West was unable to discredit the positive role which socialist Cuba played in the nonaligned movement during that critical period in its development. In the worsened international situation, Cuba conscientiously and responsibly carried out its difficult chairmanship mission of coordinating the activities of the nonaligned movement. The republic of Cuba deserves tremendous credit for the fact that under the most difficult circumstances which prevailed between 1979 and 1983 the movement not only did not lower but, showing its great vitality, even increased its political dynamism in the world arena. It is no accident that from the rostrum of the New Delhi conference, a number of delegations highly rated Cuba's role in the development of the movement. On behalf of the nonaligned countries, Indira Gandhi, the newly elected chairman, expressed their profound gratitude to Fidel Castro "for the resolve, efficiency and dignity with which he carried out the burden of the chairmanship over the past 3.5 years."

Along with traditional methods for influencing the liberated countries through threats of force, economic pressure and the use of the old "divide and rule" prescription, the ex- and neocolonizers have added some new methods to their tactics. Worsening the already tense international situation with shouts of the imaginary "Soviet threat," they have begun to proclaim themselves "guarantors" of the sovereignty and independence of the young countries, "defenders of Islam," or "fighters for the principles of noninterference."

The West began to pay particular attention to the extensive ideological indoctrination of the member countries. In this respect the imperialist countries and monopolies have done and are continuing to do everything possible to tie more firmly the liberated countries to the capitalist economic chariot and to introduce a capitalist way of life everywhere. One of the main U.S. objectives, Secretary of State Shultz has said, "is to encourage other countries to adopt the principles of self-determination, economic freedom and respect for law and order, on which American society rests." The same task is proclaimed by British Prime Minister Thatcher, who openly calls upon the nonaligned countries "to choose a fate consistent with Western ideals," and "to come closer to the Western way of life."

After a long display of their dislike of the principles of nonalignment, the United States and the other imperialist countries have begun to bend over backwards in their "respect" for it. The concept of "true nonalignment,"

aimed at isolating the movement from the other progressive forces of our time, was invented and consistently urged on the nonaligned countries. The Brussels December 1982 NATO Council session spoke out in favor of "true non-alignment," while in his greetings to the New Delhi conference, President Reagan even proclaimed the "loyalty" of the United States to the nonalignment principles!

The imperialist strategists are not continuing to encourage the concept of "equidistance" and intensively to promote it as an expanded system of views on the political, socioeconomic and international-legal aspects of nonalignment policy without ulterior motives. In its Western interpretation, the concept of "equidistance," like its base--the automatic and formal pitting of all "poor" southern countries against all "rich" northern countries, regardless of their social systems and policies--is aimed at pitting the nonaligned countries against all economically developed countries, capitalist or socialist. This is nothing but an ideological and political imperialist diversion, the purpose of which is to disorient the members of the nonaligned movement and to lump together its friends and enemies and profit from the natural aspiration of the nonaligned countries to play an independent role in the world arena.

The question asked is what kind of "true nonalignment" are the imperialists looking for and what type of "equidistance" are they supporting? A close look reveals that what they describe as "true" and welcome are only the non-alignment or "equidistance" which are consistent with their plans and which allow even the partial use of nonaligned countries to serve their own interests. The political objective of this entire diversionary act of encouraging "true nonalignment" or "equidistance" is initially to neutralize the non-aligned movement in the world arena, followed by lowering the level of its traditional anti-imperialism and, finally, establishing a "partnership" between the nonaligned countries and the West in all areas of international political and economic relations.

One cannot ignore the fact that some nonaligned countries have yielded to such exhortations and are trying to be "neither left nor right nor in the middle" (to cite Zaire's President Mobutu). In practice, in specific situations and in the face of specific problems, such "equidistance" may be reduced precisely to such a position. The ideologues of "true nonalignment" in the world of liberated countries consider the nonaligned movement a separate "third force" which can influence the course of world events entirely independently, without seeking alliances with other progressive forces. They ignore the fact that such forces, world socialism above all, are waging a struggle against the common enemy--imperialism--together with the nonaligned movement. The influence of the "equidistance" concept has begun to penetrate also some of the resolutions formulated at the movement's gatherings.

However, here again reality proves the accuracy of Lenin's conclusion to the effect that "who supports familiar views is not important. What matters is who benefits from such views" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 23, p 61). The United States and the other imperialist countries who are active supporters of the "equidistance" idea in the nonaligned movement do not even try to conceal the extent to which it suits them. They are

currently pursuing a line of actually tying the "equidistant" countries to the hegemonic plans and actions of the ruling U.S. circles in the national liberation zone. Washington is openly following a course of urging non-aligned countries everywhere--in Asia, Africa and Latin America--to violate the principles and decisions of the nonaligned movement, and to confront the anti-imperialist forces and to oppose political trends in the developing world.

Thus, active efforts are being made to preserve the inter-American military "Rio de Janeiro Treaty," which is still linking the United States with many Latin American countries, to revive the military ANZUK bloc (Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, Singapore and Malaysia), through which efforts are made to tie Singapore and Malaysia to U.S. and NATO strategy. Everything possible is being done to expand the circle of nonaligned countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, which become involved in military maneuvers with the Americans. The network of rear bases of American "rapid deployment forces" is expanding in some Asian and African countries whose territory can be used for mounting punitive actions against other members of the nonaligned movement.

The open admission is made that in this case everything is focused on protecting the "vital interests" of the United States above all, interests which are identified for propaganda purposes with those of the developing countries. "The United States cannot protect its interests by operating exclusively out of U.S. and European territory," U.S. Secretary of State Shultz has said. "We need the cooperation of Third World countries in order to have transit transportation, fuel resupply and military base rights. In the opposite case, regardless of how much we would like to increase our rapid deployment force, we can simply not deploy them without friends in the Third World, who would allow us to use their territory."

What is unquestionable, however, is the fact that neither attempts to implement the concept of "equidistance" nor the maneuverings of imperialist forces aimed at involving one nonaligned country or another in their political orbit can eliminate the objectively existing basic contradictions between the interests of the young countries and imperialist aspirations, or be able to void the objective coincidence or closeness of basic interests shared by the liberated countries and the countries of real socialism. This is supported by extensive evidence. More substantive and accurate than all "theoretical searches" conducted by the ideologues of "equidistance" is the specific answer regarding the role and place of the nonaligned movement in the deployment of global forces which the resolutions passed at its summit gatherings provide.

III

Like all previous conferences held by the movement, the New Delhi forum proved once again that by virtue of objective reasons it neither can nor could remain isolated in the international arena and that its positions inevitably come close to those of other freedom and peace-loving forces of our time in the struggle against the criminal imperialist actions and plans.

Furthermore, the proceedings and resolutions of the New Delhi conference proved the increased political maturity of the majority of nonaligned countries. The "New Delhi Appeal," the political and economic declarations and the other conference documents were a complete manifestation of the antiwar, anti-imperialist and anticolonial nature of nonalignment.

Life itself focused the work of the conference on three topical problems: war and peace, full and comprehensive decolonizing and strengthening the cohesion of the nonaligned countries. What is particularly important under the present circumstances is the fact that this unity within the ranks of the nonaligned movement was confirmed and preserved not at the cost of any concession under imperialist pressure, on which the West relied, but the preservation by the nonaligned countries of the essential positions which had already been adopted as the foundations of the political platform for their unification.

The common acknowledgement of the extreme danger presented by current trends in international relations introduced as a result of aggressive imperialist policy and the objective interconnection among the tasks of improving the global climate, ending the arms race and ensuring the economic development of the liberated countries, were immobilizing and unifying factors shared by the participants in the conference. The common aspiration of the nonaligned countries toward active peaceful coexistence and a reorganization of the international economic order which would ensure a lasting peace, security and the prosperity of all nations, was the leitmotif of the entire work and resolutions adopted at the conference. "...In the contemporary world," emphasizes the political declaration adopted at the conference, "there is no alternative to the policy of peaceful coexistence, detente and cooperation among countries, regardless of their economic and social systems, size or geographic location."

In their "New Delhi Appeal," the nonaligned countries declared their desire for "putting an immediate end to the sliding toward a nuclear conflict." They called upon the nuclear powers to take "urgent practical measures" to this effect, to observe existing agreements and to conduct more energetically talks on arms limitations. The nonaligned movement called for the immediate ban of tests, the deployment, use or threat of use of nuclear weapons by all nuclear powers, and the freezing of its arsenals. It spoke out once again firmly in favor of turning back the arms race and engaging in universal and total disarmament.

Characteristically, the statements of a large number of delegations expressed firm support of the recent peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and the proposals adopted at the Prague conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, aimed at restraining the arms race and encouraging detente. Let us particularly note the fact that the proposals formulated at the New Delhi conference in this area were once again essentially consistent with the peaceful policy and specific proposals submitted by the USSR and the entire socialist comity. This offers one more clear proof of the objective coincidence or similarity of international interests of socialist and non-aligned countries.

At the same time, as was to be expected, the U.S. and NATO aggressive policy met neither with the conference's understanding nor support. Despite the entire political, economic and propaganda pressure applied by the West on the nonaligned countries, it was sternly condemned, as it had been in Havana in 1979. Understandably, considering the pressure, not all speakers dared to call things openly by their proper name. There were even some who "seconded" the West and submitted resolutions suitable to imperialism. The consistently anti-imperialist forces within the movement were forced stubbornly to defend their positions in which they succeeded by and large. Since decisions at nonaligned movement gatherings are based on consensus, i.e., on the agreement of all participants, the targets of some accusations were not identified and the formulations of some assessments and demands were slurred over. Even under those conditions, however, the general line of the conference remained clearly anti-imperialist. All of its main accusations and demands were aimed precisely at the U.S. imperialists and their NATO allies, by whose fault the threat of a nuclear catastrophe has become aggravated. "Anti-imperialism remains the foundation of our outlook," Indira Gandhi emphasized in her speech at the conference. In its resolutions on basic problems of safeguarding peace and security, the New Delhi conference confirmed this conclusion entirely.

The conference rejected the American concepts of "nuclear deterrence" and "limited" nuclear war. It condemned the deployment of nuclear weapons by the West in various parts of the world, the cooperation "between some Western countries and Israel" in giving nuclear arms to the racist regime in South Africa, spoke in favor of establishing nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world and zones of peace and cooperation in the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, Southeast Asia, Central America and the Caribbean, called for convening an international Indian Ocean convention in 1984 and cautioned against the establishment of SATO, a South Atlantic bloc. In clear opposition to U.S. actions, it spoke out against expanding existing military bases, including the one on Diego Garcia Island in the Indian Ocean, the opening of new bases and military organizations by the great powers (meaning an American Central Command). The conference unequivocally condemned the intrigues of American imperialism against Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada and the people of El Salvador, the anti-Arab policy of the United States in the Middle East, and Washington's support of the racist South African regime. It firmly demanded of Israel and South Africa to end their aggressive policy of threat and use of force against neighboring nonaligned countries. The conference "rejected most categorically any linking or parallel between Namibian independence and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, supported by the U.S. government."

Greatly concerned with the preservation and consolidation of detente, the participants in the conference called for a political settlement of the situation in Afghanistan and Kampuchea. The efforts to seat Sihanouk, who is conspiring with the Pol Pot people, as representing Kampuchea at the conference, contrary to the will of the Kampuchean people, failed. As had already been decided at the Havana conference, for the time being Kampuchea's seat in the nonaligned movement remained vacant. As to the so-called "Afghan problem," here again the overseas enemies of the movement failed to turn it into the desired stumbling block. "If any country feels threatened and turns to

another country for military assistance, this becomes the strictly internal affair of that country," Indira Gandhi said after the conference. "We must consider this problem on the basis of balanced positions, bearing in mind what is occurring elsewhere on earth, where intervention and interference in domestic affairs take place, legitimate governments are overthrown, puppet regimes are brought to power and the domestic political situation in other countries is destabilized." In clarifying her view, I. Gandhi recalled that many countries which are now concerned about Afghanistan never said a word about the aggression against Vietnam in the past.

The conference expressed concern for the increased number of disputes and conflicts between nonaligned countries. It included in its political declaration principles concerning their peaceful settlement. Great attention was paid to achieving a peaceful political settlement of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq which, however, the conference failed to achieve.

It is clear that at the present stage of the final elimination of colonial systems, the struggle for completing the political liberation of the peoples has become more complex. The nonaligned countries are forced frequently to counter recurring aggressive sallies by the colonizers. Under such circumstances, the firm support expressed at the New Delhi conference of anti-colonial, antiracist, including anti-Zionist, positions of the nonaligned movement, whether in the matter of solidarity with the fighters for freedom in Namibia and South Africa, support of the Arab people of Palestine in the struggle for the exercise of its inalienable rights, including the right to create its own state, or support of Mauritius' demand for the restoration of the Chagos Archipelago, including Diego Garcia Island, Argentina's right to sovereignty over the Malvinas, the right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination, and so on, is of the greatest importance.

Against the background of the endless hysterical imperialist propaganda of the "Soviet military threat," and the firm rebuff of this propaganda by the nonaligned countries, the political declaration adopted at the conference expressed gratitude to the socialist and other friendly countries for their "effective solidarity with" and support of the struggle waged by the Palestinian people and the Arab nation. The appeal to the world community "to give all possible aid and support" to Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland--victims of South African state terrorism--has a great political meaning. For it is precisely the members of the socialist comity, the Soviet Union and Cuba above all, who play an important role in giving comprehensive aid to the young countries in the south of the African continent, who are victims of imperialist aggression, colonialism, neocolonialism and racism.

The increased aggressiveness of imperialism and the aggravation of international tension are unable to stop the historical process of the continuing breakdown of the colonial legacy characterized by a new stage in the national liberation movement. This process applies above all to the youngest states. Their policy of nonalignment is increasingly aimed at resolving what they frequently describe as the problem of their "second liberation," i.e., the

decolonizing of their economy and other areas of national development and international relations and opposing the recurrence of colonialism in imperialist policy.

"Officially, the colonial era has ended," I. Gandhi said at the conference. "The desire to dominate, however, remains." Consequently, the task of counteracting the aspiration of imperialism, based on the use of the vestiges and legacies of colonialism in the countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania and in their international relations, has been given priority in the activities of the nonaligned movement. It is no accident that the question of total and comprehensive decolonizing, above all of the economic liberation of the nonaligned countries, is considered today among the most important, along with the problem of war and peace, at all gatherings of the nonaligned movement.

Like previous summit conferences held by the movement, the conference in New Delhi focused on the particularly topical and important problem of the radical reorganization of international economic relations, the monetary system, the establishment of a new international economic order (NIEO) and the organization of a new international order in the field of information and communications. The heads of states and governments gathered in New Delhi emphasized in their economic declaration that peace and development are interdependent and inseparable objectives in international relations.

In continuing the line of the 1979 Havana conference, which called for worldwide talks on the establishment of an NIEO and which defined the basic directions to be followed in the collective self-support in economic cooperation among the developing countries themselves, the New Delhi conference concretized the positions of the nonaligned movement on these important matters. Having noted the lack of progress in talks with the developed Western countries, the participants in the conference adopted a declaration on the collective self-support of the nonaligned and other developing countries. Such cooperation, Fidel Castro emphasized in his book "The World Economic and Social Crisis," which was distributed at the conference as his presentation, "is an important weapon in the struggle against new colonial dependence." The conference expressed the confidence that the achievement of collective self-support of the developing countries "will immeasurably contribute to their own economic and political stability and will be a key element in the establishment of a new international economic order."

In this connection, the anti-imperialist demands in the field of economics, which were loudly voiced at the conference, assume essential significance in the economic program of the nonaligned movement. Their basic line is unquestionable. This was made particularly clear in the "New Delhi Appeal," which emphasizes that "the unbearable inequality and exploitation established by colonialism and imperialism remain the most important reasons for tensions, conflicts and violence in the world." This proves, consequently, the futility of the hopes expressed by the imperialist countries and monopolies on the eve of the conference of "substituting calm compromise for dramatic confrontation" with the developing countries in international economic relations. No other solution is possible, for the new colonizers are

unable to conceal the predatory nature of their policy behind any kind of "equal partnership" screen.

The participants in the New Delhi conference, as its results confirm, proved that the new anti-imperialist strategy of the nonaligned movement is being increasingly determined by the struggle waged by its participants for definitive economic liberation and a new international economic order. As stated in the New Delhi political declaration, the nonaligned movement today "is a catalytic agent in the efforts to convert the structure of international relations from relations of imperialist slavery and colonial domination and exploitation into a just world order based on independence, justice, cooperation and development."

The New Delhi conference provided a new impetus to the struggle waged by the progressive forces in the liberated countries for the prevention of war and against imperialism and colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. It thus confirmed once again the precise type of nonalignment which could be considered, and actually is, real. It is no accident that its results are highly valued by the nonaligned countries themselves and the other peace-loving states.

The Conference of Secretaries of Central Committees of Communist and Worker Parties of Socialist Countries, which was held in Moscow last March, welcomed "the resolutions passed at the New Delhi conference, aimed at strengthening detente and extending it to all areas on earth and the reorganization of international economic relations on a just and democratic base, which would be consistent with the interests of all nations on earth." The representatives of the fraternal parties emphasized "the growing importance of the movement of nonaligned countries in safeguarding peace."

The disappointment in the results of the conference, which neither the diplomacy nor the propaganda of the imperialist countries was able to conceal, stands out in sharp contrast. The U.S. Department of State could find nothing to say other than "the final declaration adopted at the conference is a largely unbalanced and polemical document which does not reflect the principles of nonalignment." What is it that does not suit Washington the most? It turns out that it is the "unfair attacks on the United States...and the absence of criticism of the Soviet Union." One could hardly imagine a better acknowledgement of the defeat suffered by American policy and the propaganda of "equidistance."

Nonalignment is one of the latest and most complex and multidimensional phenomena in contemporary international relations. As a whole, we can note that the nonaligned movement reached in New Delhi a new level of development. Under the circumstances of aggravated tension, the New Delhi conference gave essentially clear antimilitaristic and anti-imperialist answers to the specific urgent problems of our time.

However, it neither stopped nor could stop clashes between conflicting trends in the political development of the nonaligned movement. It is obvious that neither the United States nor the other imperialist countries are about to

abandon their course of subverting the unity of the movement and encouraging its self-isolation they consider advantageous. The struggle within and around the movement is continuing. This applies also to the practical execution of the resolutions passed in New Delhi. The prospects for the further development of the policy of the nonaligned movement can not be painted in rosy colors only.

As to the Soviet Union, its positive attitude toward the nonaligned movement is long and well-known. As was restated in the message of greetings sent to the New Delhi conference by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers, "the Soviet Union has always warmly supported the efforts of the nonaligned movement in the struggle for peace and security of the peoples, the ending of the arms race, disarmament, the reorganization of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis and total and comprehensive decolonizing."

In the difficult situation in the world, which threatens the future of all mankind and which is the result of the actions of reactionary imperialist forces, the logic of development dictates the need for the unification of all anti-imperialist forces, strengthening unity and cohesion among nonaligned countries and firming their cohesion with the socialist comity. As many participants in the nonaligned movement pointed out, it is particularly important for the movement actively to struggle against imperialism and for peace, disarmament, development and equality. "In the face of the nuclear tragedy which threatens us and the drama related to the insufficiently high level of development and the oppression of exploitation and the economic and social crisis," Fidel Castro emphasized in New Delhi, "humility and compromise have no place. Struggle is the only solution worthy of man."

The future of the nonaligned movement lies along this unquestionably difficult but most promising road.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/13

DOES THIS REPRESENT A DEVELOPMENT OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY OF CONTRADICTION?

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 111-115

[Review by Prof S. Dudel', doctor of philosophical sciences, of the book "Problemy Protivorechiya v Materialisticheskoy Dialektike" [Problems of Contradiction in Dialectical Materialism] by V. V. Borodkin. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 254 pp]

[Text] As we know, the law of unity and struggle of opposites is the concentrated expression of the basic methodological principles of Marxist-Leninist dialectics. V. I. Lenin considered this law the nucleus of all dialectical materialism which studies contradictions in the very essence of objects, processes and phenomena. That is why any new work on problems of dialectical contradiction draws close attention, a fact which entrusts its author with particularly great responsibility.

The book by V. V. Borodkin discusses the nucleus of dialectical materialism on problems which are particularly relevant today, in the conditions of the aggravated struggle between the new and the old, and tempestuously developing events in social and scientific life.

We read in the annotation of the book that "it discusses the development of the theory of dialectical contradictions in light of contemporary practice and the experience of scientific knowledge."

The initial superficial look at the book makes a positive impression on the reader with its tremendous number of examples borrowed from all possible areas of contemporary science, each one of which could be of use to a scientific worker, postgraduate student or VUZ professor working on problems of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. However, great expectations arise when we come across the author's promise "to earmark new ways of development of many problems facing the philosophy of dialectical materialism" (pp 169-170), to develop "some main features of the dialectical-materialistic theory of contradictions on the basis of the fuller mastery of the ideological and theoretical legacy of the founders of Marxism-Leninism and the summation of the experience based on contemporary practice and scientific knowledge" (p 248).

All of this creates the initial impression that it will be a question of truly scientific research which could enrich the reader with new ideas and advance the study of an important problem.

The careful reading of the monograph, however, intensifies a feeling of energetic opposition to the concepts formulated by its author. In the final account, however, the clear conviction develops that this work can only disorient an insufficiently trained reader rather than earmark "new ways" of scientific research.

The very first, one could say the "technical" requirement facing a scientific work is not to distort previous accomplishments but accurately to present their ideas even if they are to be criticized or reinforced by the views of the writer. Should the scientist try to earmark new ways in science, he should operate on the level of previous achievements, to say the least. Generally accepted norms of precise presentation or citation notwithstanding, in referring to the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, the author quite frequently distorts their thoughts so that they may fit the framework of his own ideas. Occasionally he openly changes them for no reason at all.

Since the requirement we mentioned is a prerequisite for any type of scientific activity, let us look at the way it is honored in this case.

In studying the process of commodity-monetary circulation, Marx reaches the conclusion that "capital cannot develop from circulation any more than it can outside circulation. It must develop in the course of circulation but not within it. We thus obtain a double result" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 23, p 176). The author of the monograph interprets this Marxian dialectical formula as the type of "logical contradiction" "which encompasses bourgeois thinking" (p 236). According to the author's interpretation, Marx did not resolve but "removed" this contradiction and "clearly determined that capital arises not in the course of circulation..., but through production" (p 237). It is thus that a dialectical contradiction turns into a formal-logical one.

Engels remarked in "Anti-Dühring" that "even a simple mechanical shift can be accomplished only because at that precise moment in time...the object is both in a particular spot and no longer in it. Motion is precisely the constant appearance and simultaneous resolution of this contradiction" (op. cit., vol 20, p 123).

With no critical stipulations whatsoever, the author of this monograph claims that "that same object cannot...simultaneously and in one respect be at a given place and not be in it" (p 186). He does not mention Engels or even Lenin, both of whom summed up and critically reinterpreted the outstanding achievements of historical-philosophical and scientific thinking (from Zeno's "Aporia" to Hegel's "Science of Logic"). He does not openly argue with them but ignores their reasons and arguments on the philosophical characterization of mechanical movement and simply substitutes them with his own formula.

In developing the thoughts of Hegel and Engels on the dialectically contradictory nature of motion, V. I. Lenin wrote: "Motion is an essence of time and space. Its nature is expressed by two basic concepts: (infinite) continuity (Kontinuität) and "punctuality" (or rejection of continuity, intermittence). Motion is the unity of continuity (time and space) and intermittence

(time and space). Motion is contradiction, it is a unity of contradictions" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 29, p 231). Yet here is what the author thinks in this respect: "At the present stage of knowledge one could hardly find arguments which would enable us to qualify intermittence and continuity as dialectical opposites.... The truthfulness of the hypothesis to the effect that in terms of some objects or the level of knowledge about them discreteness and continuity are dialectical opposites is unlikely" (pp 245-246). This represents not simply a distorted interpretation of Lenin's conclusions but their direct contradiction using, furthermore, references to contemporary science and the author's considerations. This is a contraposition which stems from the author's subjectivistic position rather than the actual philosophical interpretation of contemporary scientific data.

Together with Hegel, V. I. Lenin emphasized that the contradiction of the developing essence of objects, processes and phenomena is an impulse toward development (op. cit., vol 29, pp 125-127). He claimed that dialectical contradiction is the motive force, the source, the motive for "self-dynamics" in all phenomena and processes in nature (including the spirit and society) (ibid., p 317). Lenin developed in literally every single one of his scientific works this understanding of the motive role of contradictions in the nature of items studied through dialectical materialism.

The author of the monograph claims the opposite. He writes that "... Contradictions which, based on the definition of their source of development, could play a 'negative' role in terms of the development process itself. It turns out that some contradictions, in some respects at least, exert on the functioning and development of systems not a 'positive' (life-bringing, stimulating, beneficial, integrating) but, conversely, a 'negative' (fatal, hindering, destructive, entropic, disorganizing, disintegrating) effect" (p 171). Such contradictions are described in the monograph as "discontradictions" and are dealt with in a separate chapter in which we read that "the problem of 'discontradictions' was intensively developed by V. I. Lenin in the formulation and solution of the problem of the organization of integralities" (p 177).

Any object, item, phenomenon or system undergoes, most generally speaking, three basic development stages: establishment (formation), individual development and transformation into a new, a qualitatively different system. The source of all such changes is the contradiction, i.e., the unity of and struggle between opposites in the essence of the phenomenon. It simply makes no sense to pit one phase of development against another on the alleged basis of its two different sources (contradiction and "discontradiction"). The author of the monograph needs such a contraposition in order to depict the contradiction as a sort of balanced, integrating principle of the system in contrast to its disintegrating principle--the "discontradiction." In other words, unity is absolutized and pitted against the struggle of opposites. The contradiction as such is broken, torn up and deadened. This kind of "dialectics," if one could call it that, is ascribed to Lenin!

V. I. Lenin pointed out that "in any proposition one can (and must) reveal as in a 'cell' the embryos of all dialectical elements" (op. cit., vol 29, p 321).

This most important Leninist methodological stipulation is confirmed in the structure of any reasoning as the unity between the individual and the general and in any conclusion as the unity among the individual, the specific and the universal. Yet the author claims that "few would dare claim that the structure of judgments, concepts, theories and conclusions, for example, is similar to the structures in objective reality" (p 220). Furthermore, totally contradicting Lenin's theory of reflection in thoughts about life (which will be discussed later), the author writes that "the logical form of judgments and their ties does not constitute an interaction, for which reason it cannot reflect the unity and struggle of opposites" (p 243).

The nature of the "updating" of some basic concepts of the theory of dialectical materialism regarding contradictions becomes apparent, as we saw, in the simple comparison between the author's assertions and the concepts of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and the indicated arbitrary interpretation of the latter. Naturally, a mere comparison is insufficient. We must consider the author's overall stand.

In its most general definition, the author's stance is characterized by substituting a mechanistically interpreted systemic approach for a philosophical understanding and study of the dialectical contradiction. The author absolutizes his concept which he considers as the basis of philosophical, conceptual and general methodological aspects of the problem.

The reader will not find in the book any integral definition of the concept of dialectical contradiction in light of the dialectical materialistic answer to both sides of the main problem in philosophy of the correlation between thinking and life and the principles of dialectical materialism as the general theory of development. Yet, the author considers each object "regardless of the nature of its change, development, stability and instability, integrity, organization, and so on" as a specific system of contradictions (see p 27). He speaks primarily not of processes but of objects within the "object-environment" system, and not of contradictions but of opposites as the elements of this system.

Let us now see the outcome of such a substitution in resolving the dialectical problem not on a philosophical but a "general scientific" level. To begin with, the law of unity and struggle of opposites loses its status as the universal law of development, for dialectics, according to the author, does not offer a "universal criterion of development" at all (p 158). Specifically, the author surveys relations "which do not pertain to the law of unity and struggle of opposites" (see pp 90-91). In his view, this law is manifested only where there is a real interaction between the elements of a given system which coexist within the "object-environment" framework, which are distinct from each other but act in a state of unity and struggle.

The dialectical contradiction turns from internal into external, the more so since the author himself takes as real interaction the ties among elements within the system which could exist independently of the others or else either develop relations of unity and struggle or do not. He singles out an entire class of such "dialectical" opposites which "as features of a developing

system...have relations of inseparable ties and reciprocal interdependence but not interaction" (p 194).

The author scrupulously enumerates "noncontradictions" and "nonopposites" (see pp 70, 92). He takes an entire chapter to describe the "discontradictions" we mentioned.

Second of all, it is the author's conviction that the law of unity and struggle of opposites and the consequent conclusion of the correlation between unity and absolute struggle of opposites turns out to be less universal than the law of "dynamic equilibrium." He refers to the article "The Principle of Dynamic Equilibrium" by M. N. Matveyev (in the book "Filosofskiye Problemy Yestestvoznaniya" [Philosophical Problems of the Natural Sciences], Moscow, 1973), in which this principle is characterized by the fact that in specific animate and inanimate natural systems "self-motion toward a balanced condition at any arbitrarily taken moment...takes the most "suitable" direction with minimal deviation from the optimal way...the movement toward equilibrium follows the path of least resistance or, which is one and the same, the most balanced path" (see p 144 of V. V. Borodkin's monograph).

And so, the author of this monograph writes that "the experience of contemporary knowledge, the use of cybernetics in socialism and of cognitive systems, for example, leads to the conclusion of its universality" (i.e., the principle of dynamic equilibrium--S. D.) (p 144). The author grants priority to H. Spencer in the formulation of this law "on a mechanistic basis." He opposes the discrediting of this law and those who "unfortunately" "limit its realm of action" (ibid.). He believes that the underestimating of this law as a universal, a general law, expresses merely the "insufficiently high level of knowledge of the nature of both" (p 145), i.e., the law of dynamic equilibrium and the law of unity and struggle of opposites. Furthermore, the author ascribes to Lenin the understanding of the category of unity in the spirit of this universal law, in the author's view. He writes that "V. I. Lenin considered of the greatest importance in understanding unity the structural and functional coordination (harmony, balance, equilibrium or lack of equilibrium, differences, disparities) of all elements, parts, processes and forces within the system in terms of its specific function" (p 177).

The result is that Lenin's basic methodological stipulation on the relativity of unity and the absolute struggle of contradictions is replaced by a "systemic" variant of the by no means dialectical theory of equilibrium. Incidentally, this is yet one more example of the way Lenin is "processed" in the spirit of the author's concept, which evolves from dialectics to metaphysics.

So far, we have discussed the author's "ontological" approach to the law of unity and struggle of opposites. What about gnoseology? We cannot fail firmly to object to the author's abandonment of the basic principles of the Leninist theory of reflection. Following are some of the author's concepts found throughout his work. "... The object of our knowledge," he writes, "i.e., that which we represent, is the element's subjective reality and their interaction;" "the attitude toward competing theories characterizes not the specifics of the dialectics of the reflected object but the characteristics of the dialectics of the process of knowledge itself" (pp 190-191).

"On the interaction level as well, i.e., of the dialectical contradictions and development, i.e., in the opposites, relations with the classical and nonclassical image of the world are not relations of the images of objects but object relations of subjective reality which exist regardless of the knowledge of such objects" (pp 218-219).

"Naturally, dialectics dominates subjective reality as well. However, such dialectics is not the image of the dialectics of objective reality, although in some respects, on the level of the general, they are identical" (p 220).

"In dialectical logic the principle of development, the concept of contradictions, and so on, are used not as forms of reflection of objects but as forms of development of knowledge itself..." (p 60).

Isn't this reminiscent of some concepts which were subjected to withering criticism by Lenin in "Materialism and Empiriocriticism"?

However, the peak in replacing dialectics with metaphysics is reached in the conclusions to the effect that "the logical structure of a well-formulated theory should contain neither logical nor dialectical (?!!--S. D.) contradictions" (p 224). The author relates this not only to the theory but to the method of knowledge. "... Well-structured theories and methods...as specific forms of knowledge and cognition contain neither logical nor dialectical contradictions" (p 254). Such views are substantiated on the basis that a well-developed theory deals not with the process but the systematized result (see pp 224-225). The unwitting question which arises is how then to assess Marxist-Leninist philosophy and the method of dialectical materialism itself? Unquestionably, they do not contain formal-logical contradictions. In their classical philosophical works, however, Marx, Engels and Lenin depicted deliberately and in their dialectical contradiction the objective contradictions contained in developing reality. We already mentioned the famous dialectically contradictory Marxian formulas on the appearance of capital; of Engels, on the contradiction within a simple mechanical motion; and of Lenin on the reflection of motion in the logic of concepts.

If we believe the author, theory and method of Marxist-Leninist philosophy should lose their "good" theory status.

We are convinced that the author himself was not pursuing this conclusion but became entangled in underproductive innovations. Essentially, his arguments which develop a process expressed in terms of the result and the result in terms of an aspect of the process, are metaphysical.

The author's view of general dialectical problems also influences the interpretation of one problem or another in the natural and social sciences. Thus, in light of his own concept, the author believes that 'whereas the quantitative characteristics of socioeconomic contradictions within capitalism have a tendency to increase and reach a destructive limit, socialist contradictions decline" (p 113). This claim entirely agrees with the long-rejected concept of the total consistency between the two aspects of the production method in socialist society or the so-called law of "progressing

conformity" in socialist production relations and production forces. The very concept of conformity is interpreted in the monograph as "lack of contradictions" (see, for example, p 33). As a whole, the question of dialectical contradictions within socialism is affected by the confusion and inconsistency characteristic of the entire monograph, which hardly contributes to the solution of the problem raised by the development of mature socialism of "making proper use of socialist contradictions as a source and incentive for its progress" (Yu. V. Andropov, "Karl Marx's Theory and Some Problems of Building Socialism in the USSR," KOMMUNIST, No 3, 1983, p 21).

The author also expresses many general accurate concepts, along with the erroneous ones. For example, by exaggerating the significance of the so-called law of dynamic equilibrium and actually rejecting Lenin's concept of the relative nature of unity and absolute nature of the struggle of contradictions, in other parts of the work the author refers to this basic Leninist concept (compare pp 144 and 177 with p 79). However, this merely proves that wherever "new ways of development of many problems related to the philosophy of dialectical materialism" are noted, the author goes not forward but backward, away from dialectical materialism.

The eclectic and illogical nature of the work is manifested particularly clearly in the analysis of the important question of the correlation between formal-logical and dialectical contradictions. The author uses the concept of logical contradictions without generally telling us about their nature, although an entire chapter (Chapter 8) deals with contrary and dialectical opposites (i.e., with contradiction aspects).

For example, he claims that dialectical contradictions and conflicts "are inherent within the same object simultaneously and in the same respect" (p 247). However, we also read that such an understanding "contains a number of erroneous concepts" (p 241). Furthermore, the very unity and struggle of opposites is considered as maintaining different relations. "... Within the systems some opposites perform the function of communications (associations, formations) among their elements; in others, they perform the function of counteraction (division) of the ties linking these elements. For this reason we can describe the former as unity and the latter as struggle" (p 75).

Despite accurate stipulations on the limited possibilities of formal logic and the fact that "the nature of the logical contradiction excludes the possibility of its performing the function of a dialectical contradiction" (p 212), within dialectics itself the author applies exclusively the criteria of formal logic. Thus, he claims that the problem of whether antinomies are a formal-logical or a dialectical contradiction "can be resolved only through the use of the criteria of formal logic" (p 229). "The fact that the development of dialectics does not meet the requirements of formal logic proves the imperfection of its (of dialectics--S. D.) logical form" (p 59). "Specific logical problems of dialectics as a theory and method...can be resolved only through the means of formal logic" (ibid.). No comment!

To sum it up, we must sadly note that the author does not keep a single one of the promises we find at the beginning of the book. Instead of the "fuller

mastery of the ideological-theoretical legacy of the founders of Marxism-Leninism," it turns out that the author presents the thoughts of the classics either erroneously, with distortions, or else has failed to understand them.

We note a deviation from the foundations of the dialectical-materialistic theory of contradictions in terms of its main aspects.

We would not have engaged in such a detailed study of the content of this book had it not had the imprimatur of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy, and had the responsible editor not been Dr of Philosophical Sciences V. S. Tyukhtin, head of the institute's sector which deals with problems of dialectical materialism and at which the monograph's author works.

Is the viewpoint of the author that of the sector of the Institute of Philosophy? This question calls for an answer, particularly in light of the requirements formulated in the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress on the truly creative development of Soviet philosophy.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003
CSO: 1802/13

HAS THE CATEGORY OF ESSENTIALITY BEEN ELABORATED IN MARXISM?

AU051300 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 115-116

[Article by G. Sadovskiy, candidate of philosophical sciences and docent at the Minsk Radioengineering Institute]

[Text] Soviet philosophers have received the just criticism that was directed at them from the rostrum of the 26th CPSU Congress with an awareness of their great responsibility. Concrete measures aimed at resolutely overcoming the tendency for scholastic theoreticizing, and at further creatively developing Marxist-Leninist philosophy, and theoretically generalizing in a profound manner on the real experience of communist construction and scientific and technical progress, are being elaborated and implemented in the collectives of academies and higher educational institutions. In this connection, the initiative of the journal VOPROSY FILOSOFII--which last year held a conference on problems of dialectical and historical materialism and published its results--is an initiative which deserves approval.

However, these materials unfortunately bear evidence of the fact that certain scholars have still failed to discard the habit of proving that which has already been proven. What is more, some of them try to disprove that which is incontestable. The statement by Doctor of Philosophy E. K. Voishvillo, professor of the philosophical faculty of the Moscow State University, can be quoted as an example. E. K. Voishvillo correctly supposes that "the concept of essentiality is of great importance for the understanding of many processes of cognition." However, the following statement of his cannot fail to arouse surprise: "It (the concept of essentiality--G.S.) has not been worked out at all, either in Marxism, or in science as a whole (positivism declared it to be a pseudoconcept and, unfortunately, even at present it is at times considered as verging on bad taste to talk about the essence of phenomena)" (VOPROSY FILOSOFII, No 5, 1982, p 29).

It is difficult to say which content the author of the above-cited theses would like to put into the concept of essence, but it is quite clear that by uttering this statement he ignores, however strange it may seem, that rich dialectical-materialistic content of the category of "essentiality" which was long ago elaborated upon in Marxism-Leninism.

It is well known that the dialectical-materialistic concept of essentiality (taken as the essentiality of self-movement, the development of phenomena and their dialectical contradictiveness) is the core of the logic of K. Marx's

"Das Kapital." It is comprehensively investigated in Lenin's "Philosophical Notebooks." Particularly valuable in this respect is the summary of the section "The Science of Logic" from Hegel's "The Teaching of Essentiality" which is included in the "Philosophical Notebooks." As a result of this enormous theoretical work, V. I. Lenin formulates the following conclusion which lays the foundation for Marxist dialectics: "Dialectics as such is studying contradiction in the very essence of objects...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 29, p 227).

Regardless of the subjective intentions professed by E. K. Voishvillo to develop Marxist dialectical logic, his position with regard to the achievements of Marxism in investigating the concept of essentiality (achievements based on summarizing the entire history of human cognition and revolutionary experience) objectively aims at working out such dialectical logic which excludes ...dialectics!

This tendency is also clearly manifested in the definition of dialectical logic as proposed by E. K. Voishvillo. In his opinion, "dialectical logic is a science dealing with the laws of forming and developing knowledge at the stage of abstract thinking" [VOPROSY FILOSOFII, No 5, 1983, p 30].

Of course, it is impossible not to agree with E. K. Voishvillo that dialectical logic investigates the laws of forming and developing knowledge at the stage of abstract thinking as well. However, at the same time, it is permissible to ask why living contemplation and practice are left outside the limits of Marxist dialectical logic (that is logic which is based on the principles of materialism and aimed at perceiving objective truth), whereas in Lenin's classical formulation the dialectical path of perceiving objective reality leads the living contemplation to abstract thinking and from the latter, to practice. Does perception not operate with all the categories of dialectical logic (and first and foremost with the concept of essentiality) in ASCENDING from that which is concrete (such as "living contemplation") to that which abstract (and not only at the STAGE of abstract thinking)? Or is it that even without referring to them, thinking is capable of putting together truly scientific abstractions while ascending from that which is concrete to that which is abstract? How can the "new" definition of the subject of dialectical logic be united on the basis of dialectical materialism with Lenin's definition of its main requirements, one of which states precisely that "all human experience must be included in the full 'definition' of the subject both as the criterion of truth and a practical determinant of the connection of the subject with that which man requires"? (op. cit., vol 42, p 290).

If the sphere of activity of dialectical logic is limited to abstract thinking, and abstract thinking itself is confined to "perception connected with the use of speech as a means of reflecting reality" (VOPROSY FILOSOFII, No 5, 1982, p 29), and if abstract thinking is reduced to operating with the external, linguistic, and abstract-universal forms which, as a result of this, are neutral both gnoseologically and from the point of view of world outlook, then, guided by this "model" of dialectical logic, science will be forced to resort exclusively to abstract truths. Meanwhile, Lenin explained in a

popular form that "dialectical logic instructs us that there is no 'abstract truth and that truth is always concrete'" (op. cit., vol 42, p 290). This is precisely the reason Lenin points out very definitely, when defining the real subject of dialectical logic, that it is "a teaching not of the external forms of thinking but of the laws of development...of the entire concrete content of the world and its perception" (op. cit., vol 29, p 84).

In the opinion of E. K. Voishvillo, "the development of dialectical logic must...in particular be directed toward concretizing already known concepts" (VOPROSY FILOSOFII, No 5, 1982, p 29). However, it is not clear which concepts must be concretized, when even the fundamental category of dialectical logic is declared as not having been worked out in Marxism and science as a whole?

Undoubtedly, Marxist dialectical logic is no dogma--which is brilliantly demonstrated by the Leninist stage in developing the philosophy of Marxism--but a constantly progressing science. However, stating this indisputable fact, it is necessary (in order not to transform the methodology of revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action into a sanctuary of dilletantism and scholastic theoreticizing) not to lose sight of the essence of the real path of developing Marxist dialectical logic.

At the beginning of his speech at the conference on problems of dialectical materialism, E. K. Voishvillo stated that much attention has been devoted over many years to the problems of dialectical logic, but at the same time, he complained that "we have not advanced very much from the main principles and laws which were already formulated by the classics of Marxism-Leninism" (VOPROSY FILOSOFII, No 5, 1982, p 29).

If, under "we," the critic understands himself and those authors whose views have already been criticized by KOMMUNIST, then it is hardly right to say, "we have not advanced very much"--it would seem that a self-critical admission that they have "moved away from these principles would be more precise ... We would also like to bring this fact to the attention of the editorial board and editorial office of the journal VOPROSY FILOSOFII.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

CSO: 1802/13

MANAGERIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR END RESULTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 117-118

[Letter to the editor by Candidate of Economic Sciences S. Protserov, CPSU member since 1932]

[Text] In calling for improving the style and methods of economic management on the basis of the Leninist management principles, the 26th Party Congress emphasized the need "to upgrade the responsibility of ministries, departments, associations and enterprises and their managers for assignments and work results." Many among our managers are distinguished today by their ability to work most efficiently. Naturally, time has increased the requirements facing the manager and his workstyle, energy and initiative. Unfortunately, not everyone has already realized the need to reorganize his activities under the present more complex circumstances. An atmosphere of high exigency, efficiency and individual responsibility for assignments has not been developed everywhere as yet.

"There still remain many economic managers," noted Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, at the November 1982 Central Committee Plenum, "who while willingly quoting Leonid Il'ich's inspiring words to the effect that the economy must be economical, do little in practice to resolve this problem.

"Clearly, the force of inertia and the old customs are still extant. There also are some who obviously simply do not know how to work. We must think of the type of help which must be given to such comrades. The main thing is to accelerate our efforts to improve all realms of economic management--administration, planning and the economic mechanism."

Unquestionably, production managers should be the first to be held accountable for the failure of planned assignments. In this case, the formulation of a reliable and efficient mechanism of responsibility for end results and, particularly, the personal material liability of managers, would be of great importance.

The problem of individual responsibility of economic managers for end results is not new. It is already found in the works of V. I. Lenin, who defined the nature of the motor of the socialist economy after the elimination of private ownership. Lenin considered cost-effectiveness as one such efficient factor and the responsibility of managers as one of its basic elements. In his 1922

letter to People's Commissar of Finance Sokol'nikov, Lenin wrote that "I believe that trusts and enterprises operating on a cost-effectiveness basis have been set up precisely in order to be fully responsible themselves for the profitable work of their enterprises" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 54, p 150).

In 1931 the USSR Central Executive Committee and Sovnarkom passed the decree "On Responsibility for Nonfulfillment of Contractual Orders and Deliveries to the Socialized National Economic Sector," which stipulated that in cases of contractual violations by economic organs of their obligations based on orders from and deliveries to state industry, transportation, agriculture and other sectors, plant directors and other officials in charge of implementing said order or delivery would be prosecuted for the commission of an official crime.

Yet at that time enterprise specialization and cooperation were merely at their initial stage. What type of liability should there be today for failure to fulfill the plan, considering that economic relations and ties have become thousands of times more complex?

Lenin's instructions on the need for strict order under which managers would be fully responsible for the results of enterprise activities remain relevant. Unfortunately, the existing forms of personal responsibility on the part of economic managers for end work results are undereffective. Measures such as reducing the collective material incentive fund or individual loss of bonuses for specific adverse indicators are off target. They do not encourage economic managers to carry out measures to reduce production costs and upgrade work efficiency. We must also bear in mind that even depriving economic managers of their basic bonus is compensated in a number of cases by bonuses they receive from other sources, such as the installation of new equipment, exports, and so on. This lowers the importance of the loss of bonuses earned through the basic system. The system of material sanctions and fines for violations of contractual deliveries is equally undereffective in the absence of individual material liability on the part of economic managers.

In our view, stricter measures should be applied. Individual material liability should be tied to the salary. Nonfulfillment of planned assignments should entail the lowering of wages by 20-30 percent and the loss of bonuses from all other sources such as to compensate for losses (nonfulfillment of the production cost plan) during a subsequent period such as one quarter, 1 year or, on a cumulative basis, the entire five-year plan. Experience does exist in this area. Some socialist countries apply similar evaluations of results of economic activities based exclusively on annual results. In Hungary higher- and middle-level managers may lose, respectively, 25 and 15 percent of their salaries should the enterprise end its fiscal year with a loss.

In discussing the right of the masses to control the production process and other forms of democratic management, V. I. Lenin also noted that the process of collective labor cannot be left "without a precise determination of the

responsibility of the manager and without the strictest possible order established through the will of the manager" (op. cit., vol 36, p 157). For example, in the past the ZIL had applied several forms of material liability. Quarterly and annual losses were compiled for the individual shops on a cumulative basis and compensated through subsequent savings, which led to a reduction in bonuses, unless the shop's management failed to formulate and apply additional measures aimed at reducing production costs. During some work periods, the salaries of some shop managers were even reduced by as much as 25 percent in the case of cost overruns. The management of shops which had not allowed such overruns and had made skillful use of all available means for the implementation of the collective's assignments over a 1- or 2-year period was given bonuses. Unfortunately, following the conversion to the new system of planning and economic incentive in 1965, such shop measures were dropped largely as a result of the absence of a similar system for the material responsibility of managers.

Individual material liability must be applied above all to the association's (enterprise's) director, for he assumes greater responsibility with the greater rights given to him and his greater autonomy compared with other managers. All of this inevitably requires a reorganization of the mechanism of responsibility in the work of superior economic and planning organizations, which would help to improve their activities.

There are those who believe that association (enterprise) managers lack the necessary autonomy. It would be useless to enumerate the extensive rights they have been granted, although their increase would be expedient. The main problem today is that even existing rights are being violated. Inevitably, the question will arise in resolving the problem of individual material responsibility. Furthermore, some managers consider the lack of individual material responsibility an opportunity for practicing unlimited autonomy, thus justifying their negligence.

The decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress make it incumbent not only to take steps to implement the specific measures earmarked by the congress on accelerating the conversion of our economy to intensive development, but earmark means for further improvements in the entire economic mechanism. In combining material with moral incentives for economic managers of associations and enterprises with individual material responsibility for end results we create conditions which contribute to the development in such personnel of initiative, enterprise and responsibility. This would enable us to ensure the successful implementation of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress on enhancing the work standard of our economic mechanism and implementing the 11th Five-Year Plan.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/13

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY--FOR THE PEOPLE

AU081240 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, pp 119-123

[Article by G. Volkov]

[Text] It is known that V. I. Lenin inseparably linked socialist and communist transformations with the development of science and technology. He was of the opinion that socialism requires creating "technical equipment built according to the very latest achievements of modern science." ("Complete Works," vol 26, p 300)

The entire heroic path traversed by our country has proved that these words are true. Building the foundation of socialism in the thirties would have been impossible without previously industrializing the national economy. Fascism would not have been sure to suffer a crushing defeat in the great fatherland war if powerful military equipment had not been produced. After reconstructing the national economy and consolidating the material-technical base we had the opportunity to accomplish new social transformations, subsequently entering the stage of developed socialism. Finally, as the 26th CPSU Congress emphasized, in the eighties a national economic structure is being formed that will make it possible for us to progress even further along the path of building communism and implementing its ideals.

During the entire history of our country, the Communist Party has played a guiding role with regard to scientific-technical progress, determined the ways and methods of accelerating it in every possible measure, and directed its results--entirely in the interests of the people--toward raising the people's well-being and solving social tasks.

At present the tasks of accelerating scientific-technical progress, rendering it more effective and organically uniting its results with the advantages of socialism are raised particularly acutely.

The book by V. V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, is imbued with deep reflections on this subject. (Footnote 1) (V.V. Shcherbitskiy: "Scientific-Technical Progress--A Party Concern. From the Working Experience of Ukrainian Party Organizations in Implementing the Decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress on Accelerating Scientific-Technical Progress," Kiev, "Politizdat Ukrainsk," (1983)

The book deals with and evaluates the multifaceted experience of Ukrainian party organizations in accelerating scientific-technical progress. However, the book is not confined to regional concerns. It provides a general picture of the course and development of the scientific-technical revolution in our country, uncovers its essence and directions and its nature under the conditions of socialism and capitalism.

All this makes the book doubly interesting for readers all over the country from both the party-political and scientific-theoretical viewpoints, which, however, are organically united in the book.

The author writes: "In the middle of the 20th century a period of thorough and basic qualitative changes--that of the scientific-technical revolution--began in the development of mankind's productive forces." (p 17) The very first lines emphasize the social nature of this revolution. The essence of the scientific-technical revolution consists of the fact that it takes place at a stage characterized primarily by mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism. The world revolutionary process and the scientific-technical revolution are not merely processes which take place at the same time; they are closely intertwined and exert a mutual influence. The scientific-technical revolution objectively plays the part of a powerful stimulator for accelerating social progress and it is a bridgehead in the struggle between two world systems. Its essence is impossible to understand if the development of science is regarded as divorced from social processes. The correct understanding of the scientific-technical revolution--as a law-governed phenomenon characteristic of the stage of world revolutionary renewal--is possible only from the methodological positions of Marxism-Leninism. This is how the author formulates his initial and basic positions.

Since the scientific-technical revolution is of a global nature, it is characterized by common specific features. These are: the discovery and utilization of new sources of energy, particularly nuclear energy; the creation and mass production of man-made materials; the development on a wide scale of radio and television equipment; the implementation of progressive technology discoveries in molecular biology and genetics and the rapid development of the microbiological industry; successes in the sphere of space transportation technology and in practically mastering cosmic space near the Earth; and many other things.

With such an abundance of striking achievements in science and technology it is difficult to bring to light the deep essence of the scientific-technical revolution. V. V. Shcherbitskiy notes that in the sixties it was predominantly regarded in scientific literature as a dialectical leap confined exclusively to science and technology themselves and a particular turning point in scientific-technical progress which prepares--as its consequence--a transformation of the production forces and a new industrial revolution. Even by the early seventies further investigations on the basis of Marxist-Leninist methodology demonstrated that the scientific-technical revolution is a basic qualitative transformation of the entire system of the society's production forces and a revolution of the production forces themselves.

"As a deep transformation of the society's production forces, the scientific-technical revolution causes changes in all elements and factors of material production and, first and foremost, in the main production force--the people, their knowledge, experience, production qualifications, the content and nature of their work and the structure of the labor force. As an embodiment of the direct mutual influence and interaction between science and technology and production, the scientific-technical revolution is a "complex socioeconomic phenomenon." (p 53) Automation of production most radically alters the nature and content of human labor and the place of the individual in production. Therefore, the author maintains that the centerpoint of the scientific-technical revolution is "automation and the comprehensive mechanization of production, which result in the individual's liberation from the immediate production process and a switch in his efforts over to controlling the activity of automated machine systems." (Ibid)

The role of science, which becomes a direct production force, substantially grows in the course of the scientific-technical revolution and production is transferred to a genuinely scientific basis, while at the same time science itself becomes industrialized. The level of education and qualification of the working people rises sharply on a mass scale.

The role of the party's scientific guidance in social processes--aimed at securing the progressive development of all aspects of the socialist society--is further enhanced. Finally, there is a growing "intensification" of all social processes, and a socially homogeneous communist society and harmonically developed personality are formed.

Noting that the socialist production relations are adequate to the qualitative leap in production forces which takes place in the course of the scientific-technical revolution, V. V. Shcherbitskiy emphasizes that this does not mean that there are no contradictions between these two aspects of the society's development. However these contradictions are not antagonistic or of a destructive and conflicting nature, but form a source of the progress and the further perfection of the entire system of social relations under socialism. On the contrary, when capitalist social relations dominate, the development of the scientific-technical revolution leads to the exacerbation of antagonistic contradictions and, first and foremost, of those between production forces and production relations and, in the final analysis, between the main classes of the capitalist society. Those contradictions can only be resolved by a social revolution.

On the whole the scientific-technical revolution sharply exacerbated the clash between the two world social systems--capitalism and socialism--in all spheres, be it economic, scientific-technical, foreign-political, ideological, or cultural. In this connection the author paints an impressive picture of the progressive degradation of the capitalist society under the influence of the scientific-technical revolution and its convulsive attempts to stop the inexorable course of history.

At present imperialism primarily utilizes the achievements of science and technology not for creative but for destructive purposes, namely, to pursue an unprecedented arms race and create more and more new means of mass destruction.

The lethal danger of nuclear war hovers over mankind. The nuclear arsenal already amounts to 1.5 million bombs with the same power as the one that was dropped on Hiroshima. There is enough of them to destroy all life on Earth 15 times over. And this death-carrying arsenal continues to grow at ever increasing speed. Who is the initiator of this insane arms race? It is the United States and the ruling circles of a country with a high level of scientific-technical progress which in fact amounts to regression. The best minds of the United States are busy inventing miniature nuclear charges, killer-satellites, methods of building military bases on the moon, which has already been declared "a sphere of vital interest" of U.S. imperialism, as well as breeding and creating harmful viruses and poisons, working out methods of creating artificial earthquakes, tsunami and so forth. Responsible, or to be more precise, irresponsible Washington officials openly declare that there is allegedly nothing terrible in a "limited" nuclear war, although, according to their own calculations, in its very first hours at least 400 million people will die!

Citing all these awful facts V. V. Shcherbitskiy maintains: "In its hatred of the future, imperialism would like to kill all life on our planet. However, there exists a force which is capable of preventing this. This force is real socialism with its defensive and scientific-technical might, as well as dozens of millions of communists on all continents, hundreds of millions of fighters for peace and, finally, mankind which does not want to perish in nuclear flames for the sake of profit for the monopolies." (pp 40-41) While nuclear war is being prepared the most aggressive imperialist forces headed by the United States have unleashed a real "psychological war" against the socialist countries utilizing the new technical achievements in the sphere of mass information media.

These achievements are quite substantial. The last two decades alone saw enormous changes in radio, television and polygraphy technical equipment. Radio stations have become a lot more powerful and the possibility of beaming their broadcasts at clearly defined regions has greatly improved. Communication satellites, particularly those in geostationary orbits, have simplified to the maximum the transmission of television signals over huge territories. The technical prerequisites have been created to transfer information through a communication systems based on lasers and fiberglass technology. At present there are an estimated 25,000 radio stations and over 1 billion radio sets on Earth; more than 400 million television sets and over a hundred telegraph agencies are in operation. Tens of thousands of newspapers and magazines and about 1,500 book titles are published daily in many millions of copies.

These achievements can be used both for the benefit of the human being and to harm him. Since the capitalist countries the mass information media are in the hands of monopolies, "under the conditions of the scientific-technical revolution the monopoly held by the bourgeoisie over the means of intellectual production and in fact on 'duping' viewers and listeners and implanting the ideas of violence, obscurantism and racism is consolidated" (p 37). A kind of "repressive information system" (p 39) is in operation to disseminate anticommunist propaganda, and as a result well-worn anti-Soviet cliches are rammed into a large group of people in the capitalist world. In connection with this the author introduces the idea of "cultural imperialism" and

"cultural genocide" of the developed capitalist countries in relation to the developing countries. Since in most cases the latter do not have a modern technical base for information and culture at their disposal, they are placed under powerful information pressure from the imperialist countries and are subjected to ideological expansion. Thus, according to the data provided by UNESCO, the share of imported television material in the national programs of the developing countries reaches 90 percent.

New processes brought about by the scientific-technical revolution in the contemporary world have generated many ideological concepts by the bourgeois theoreticians. As a rule their distinguishing feature is technological determinism either of an optimistic or pessimistic shade. The author points out that in recent times it is the latter tendency which has prevailed; a number of ideologists represent the crisis of bourgeois society in all its aspects as the approaching destruction of human civilization, as a result of population growth, exhausted natural resources, polluted environment or as a result of the suppression of mankind by the "megamachine" of its own making and its own inability to control "demonic technology." As we see technology and science are considered to be independent and held responsible for the vices of the capitalist society. In this connection it is maintained that the same vices of "industrial civilization" allegedly characterize socialism as well.

The book notes that the fact should not, of course, be overlooked that, under socialism as well, the scientific-technical revolution poses a number of problems in the ecological and demographic spheres and in the utilization of labor resources and guidance of the scientific-technical progress. However, the socialist society has all the possibilities necessary for their solution.

The author does not confine himself to these general statements but concretely analyzes the multifaceted processes which take place in our country under the influence of the scientific-technical revolution. In this context he uncovers both the positive and negative aspects of these processes.

Thus, in principle automation leads to enriching labor with creative functions and requires an ever-growing level of general and professional education. However, at the contemporary stage the insufficiently high level of scientific-technical progress quite often leads to impoverishing the content of labor.

For example, the introduction of the semi-automatic conveyor belts, while liberating the people from hard physical labor, substitutes for it monotonous operations which cannot guarantee that the worker maintains a steady interest in his job.

How is this problem to be solved? For example, it is advisable that participation in this type of labor be restricted only to the initial and relatively short period in the activity of workers after which (on the basis of reeducation and requalification) it is necessary to transfer them to jobs requiring higher qualification.

Regarding the changes in the relations between individuals under the influence of scientific-technical progress and urbanization, the author on the whole

positively evaluates them. However, he also draws our attention to the fact that contacts between people have become limited. Thus, whereas at the beginning of the 20th century a city dweller spent about 70 percent of his free time with other individuals, at present he spends more time in front of the television screen, listening to the radio or reading newspapers and magazines.

The scientific-technical revolution exerts considerable influence on the requirements of the individual. In this context the most important features of these requirements are changed, and their content, direction and ties with the economic and intellectual factors of society's life are also changed. "And the decisive role is played by the social characteristics of labor, which guarantee that the need to work, as the most important social quality of a new type of person, is formed and satisfied" (p 85). There is a noticeable process of a relative increase in the intellectual requirements which are connected with the fact that work has become pithier and more intellectual, and the level of education has been raised. "In short, under socialism, in the era of the scientific-technical revolution, there is a qualitative leap in developing the requirements of the individual. In this connection the law of rising demand as formulated by V. I. Lenin manifests itself in a peculiar way" (p 86). However, in this context it is necessary for the party and other public organizations to carry out the corresponding educational and organizational activity.

All the questions concerning life in general and the everyday life of the people require the attention of these organizations. "Wherever the people's needs are concerned nothing is unimportant" (p 92).

The book formulates the main directions of the social policy of the party, taking into account the requirements of the scientific-technical revolution. These are the drawing together of the workers, peasants and intelligentsia regarding their position in the system of economic relations on the basis of the gradual merging of the two forms of socialist ownership; overcoming the dissimilarity in the social labor of different social groups and strata; wiping out the differences in the cultural-technical level of all social groups; evening out the incomes of the different population groups on the basis of raising labor productivity and reducing the differentiation in the qualificational education of the working people as well as the drawing together of the way of life and conditions of everyday life of soical groups and strata.

The highest goal of the CPSU's social policy is to create conditions that would allow, in F. Engels's words, "all of society's members to develop as comprehensively as possible, to maintain and display their abilities." (K. Marx and F. Engels: "Works," vol 20, p 206)

Whereas the scientific-technical revolution contributes to perfecting socialist relations, the better developed social relations in turn create new possibilities for acceleration scientific-technical progress. This second aspect of the problem also receives a great deal of attention in the book. The author investigates in detail the different aspects of the scientific-technical policy of the CPSU.

In particular it states that it is necessary to direct the efforts of scientists toward working out new progressive technologies and up-to-date complexes and systems of machinery and mechanisms. Previously it took a long time to innovate technology. "The basic distinction of the contemporary stage of scientific-technical progress lies in the fact that, for a number of reasons, there is an imminent objective necessity to fully technologically reequip modern production in a matter of 20-30 years" (p 117).

Traditional technologies are, as a rule, oriented toward the extensive use of energy, materials and other types of technical resources. New technologies will result in the resource-saving intensification of production; a sharp increase in labor productivity with considerable reduction in capital investments; the maximum expansion of the resource base of production; the maximum reduction of the negative effects of society's productive activity on the environment as well as the maximum use of biological "mechanisms" of living nature; and the automation of information processes.

In the course of the 10th Five-Year Plan, measures related to new technologies in Ukrainian industry accounted for more than 47 percent of the total savings resulting from reduced production costs and 37 percent of the savings in labor expenditures (see p 158).

The book draws our attention to the enormous possibilities for utilizing computers and systems of automatic control. However, these possibilities are only starting to open up. The workload of computers is still insufficient, their downtimes are high and the share of optimization tasks solved by computers is still extremely small. Many computer centers are equipped with incomplete sets, have inadequate facilities and experience a shortage of qualified cadres. There is a lack of coordination in designing automatic control systems. Successes have mainly been scored only in utilizing the electronic memory and the mathematical potential offered by the instruments. However, in order to control economic objectives it is necessary to establish adequately developed forms of dialogue between the human and the machine and the participation of the latter in operational control and decisionmaking. This presupposes the need to bring the entire organizational control up to a new level.

V. V. Shcherbitskiy emphasizes that it is life's requirement to bring up to a higher level the entire planning and economic work which guarantees that a correct scientific-technical policy is worked out. The plan is the main instrument of implementing the economic policy of the party.

In this connection it is disturbing, in the author's opinion, that the planning and executive discipline in the sphere of creating and mastering new technical equipment often is not up to standard. Some ministries fail to fulfill their plans for developing science and technology. In two recent years a number of oblasts have also failed to reach planned indexes. At certain enterprises no work aimed at perfecting the technological processes of automation and mechanization has been carried out at all. This is of course unacceptable.

Bureaucracy, formalism, the drawing up of slapdash plans and the substitution of scientific planning for hare-brained schemes are counterindicative for scientific-technical creative activity. We cannot fail to recall the instruction left by Peter the Great: "All plans must be very correct, so that state money is not wasted and no damage is done to the Fatherland. Whoever makes slapdash plans will lose his office and be whipped on my orders." (p 346)

Naturally the acceleration of the scientific-technical progress does not happen by itself. Here, as everywhere else, communists are called upon to play a vanguard role. The book demonstrates, by means of concrete examples, how important in this respect are the initiative and energy of communists in all sectors of public production.

Looking into the future, K. Marx wrote that "communists will have to demonstrate that only under communist relations can those technological truths which have already been discovered be implemented in practice..." (K. Marx and F. Engels: "Works", vol 27, p 483). Just how true Marx's prediction was is demonstrated at present under socialism by expanding in all possible measures the scientific-technical revolution and directing all its achievements toward the benefit of the human being.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

CSO: 1802/13

CREATIVE APPROACH TO PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEMS IN MEDICINE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 123-125

[Review by Prof G. Vekua, doctor of philosophical sciences, of the following books: (1) "Metodologicheskiye i Sotsial'nyye Problemy Meditsiny i Biologii. Sbornik Nauchnykh Trudov" [Methodological and Social Problems in Medicine and Biology. Collection of Scientific Works]. No 1. G. A. Yugay, responsible editor. Moscow, 1978, 180 pp; (2) "Determinizm i Teoriya Prichinnosti v Patologii" [Determinism and the Theory of Causality in Pathology] by V. P. Petlenko, A. I. Strukov and O. K. Khmel'nitskiy. Meditsina, Moscow, 1978, 260 pp; (3) "Filosofskiye Aspeky Gerontologii" [The Philosophical Aspects of Gerontology] by T. V. Karsayevskaya and A. T. Shatalov. Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 216 pp; (4) "Filosofiya Meditsiny" [Philosophy of Medicine] by V. P. Petlenko and G. I. Tsaregorodtsev. Zdorov'ya, Kiev, 1979, 230 pp; (5) "Sotsial'naya Determinirovannost' Biologii Cheloveka" [Social Determinism in Human Biology] by K. Ye. Tarasov and Ye. K. Chernenko. Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 366 pp; (6) "Dialektika i Teoriya Meditsiny" [Dialectics and Theory of Medicine] by A. A. Korol'kov. Leningrad University Press, Leningrad, 1979, 100 pp; (7) "Chelovek kak Predmet Filosofskogo i Yestestvenno-Nauchnogo Poznaniya" [Man as Subject of Philosophical and Natural Science Study] by V. F. Serzhantov and V. V. Grechanyy. Leningrad University Press, Leningrad, 1980, 216 pp; (8) "Filosofskiye Problemy Meditsiny (Beseda s Uchenymi. Otvety na Pis'ma Chitateley)" [Philosophical Problems in Medicine (Conversation with Scientists. Answers to Letters to the Editor)]. Znaniye, Moscow, 1981, 63 pp; (9) "Gnoseologicheskiye Problemy Prichinnosti v Meditsine" [Gnosiological Problems of Causality in Medicine] by V. G. Yerokhin. Meditsina, Moscow, 1981, 87 pp]

[Text] Modern medicine faces complex problems. Their fruitful solution cannot be achieved exclusively through further progress in biology. It also requires the use of methods, concepts and principles of physics, cybernetics, chemistry, mathematics, psychology, sociology and others. Marxist-Leninist philosophy plays a major role in the overall system of sciences involved in the development of the difficult theoretical problems arising in medicine: It acts as a conceptual and general-methodological foundation in formulating the optimal strategy of scientific development in the area of medical knowledge.

In this connection, works published in recent years, which reflect, from our viewpoint, most clearly the main trends followed in the study of the philosophical aspects of theoretical medicine are of scientific and social interest.

If we were to single out the main direction followed by the changes in such studies we would see a similarity with developments in the area of philosophical problems in physics, biology and, as was noted at the Third All-Union Conference on Philosophical Problems in the Modern Natural Sciences (Moscow, April 1981), the highlighting of the sociovalue aspect of theoretical problems in medicine alongside the methodological one.

The problem of the correlation between the social and the biological in man began to draw attention to itself by roughly the second half of the 1960s, thanks to the works of G. I. Tsaregorodtsev, A. M. Izutkin, Yu. P. Lisitsyn, S. Ya. Chikin, A. F. Polis, and others. Later works, recent ones in particular, show a greatly increased interest in this problem. It was determined that its solution greatly affects the direction and depth of research in a number of theoretical problems of medical knowledge. That is precisely why all the works mentioned in this review contain, either implicitly or, in most cases, directly one interpretation of it or another. This particular problem is the topic of a comprehensive and thorough study in (5).

The authors justifiably point out the erroneousness of the view that the problems of the social aspect of man are in the realm of historical materialism, while the problem of human biology is exclusively in the field of dialectical materialism. Dialectical materialism cannot be considered exclusively a methodology applicable to the natural sciences, while historical materialism is strictly applicable to the social sciences. All sciences share a single general philosophical dialectical-materialistic method. In discussing the nature of man, K. Ye. Tarasov and Ye. K. Chernenko clearly prove the fruitfulness of this approach. On the basis of the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin in the areas of philosophy, political economy and the theory of scientific communism, the authors convincingly prove that the founders of Marxism firmly held a monistic position on this matter. The nature of man is one: It is social, whereas the biological part is socially determined and subordinated to the social. This conclusion, as expressed in the book, is based on the dialectical solution of the problem of the correlation between the forms of motion of matter and the systemic method used in the scientific study of complexly organized objects.

The development of the social form of matter dynamics has the characteristic feature that the natural principle seems to "lie in the foundations," becoming the carrier of a superior quality; relations of subordination are established between the lower and higher systems. The social determination of human biology has put an end to its "purely" biological existence and turned it into a subordinate aspect of the human social system. Both as entity and individual, man is a social being. "The trend in social development leads to the increasing socialization of the biological principle in man" (p 62).

The authors carefully trace the social determination of the ontogenetic development of modern man, singling out its individual stages and the basic social facts which influence it. The book discusses in detail the social determination in human ecology. Chapter V ("Strengthening the Health of the Working People Is an Important Social Task Under Developed Socialist Conditions") studies the various aspects of the socialist way of life as the main social factor in caring for the people's health. The authors' principal merit is drawing attention to the social determination in human biology.

Bringing up the correlation between the biological and the social in man to the front end in research and the consequent results have already brought about substantial changes in the overall orientation of theoretical medicine: Whereas previously it was essentially a natural or, rather, a biological science, now it is increasingly developing in the social area.

The trend leading to the creation of a new discipline, manifested in recent years, is of interest: it is the science of normology, or the theory of norms in medicine. It is based above all on the socio-prophylactic trend in Soviet medicine and the concern shown by our state for the health of the people. The clearly manifested social aspect of such a theory is unquestionable: It studies the development of the habitat, the functioning of the organism and the development of man (exceptionally important, considering the growing disparity between the accelerating unrhythmic pace of life and work under the conditions of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution and human adaptability). "Normology must develop as the science of man's optimal development and habitat, the prospects for reaching the limit in the life of the species and mastering methods for its extention and the harmonious combination of physical, spiritual and social health" ((6), p 71).

In monograph (4), the authors set the methodological task of converting from the concept of norm which, from their viewpoint, "is the basic concept in medicine, embryology and the theory of evolution, for it expresses, like a basic cell, the theory of science" (p 118), to the elaboration of a system of philosophical principles governing the structure of the theory of norms (normology) (see p 121). The authors consider the basic methodological prerequisites for the development of the theory of the individual from the positions of dialectical materialism and its influence on the understanding of the social aspects of norm and anomalies. "The question of human health and disease," they emphasize, "cannot be limited only to biological research by its very nature. Human health and illness must be considered together with man's social nature. We must study the integral phenomenon (man) rather than merely part of it, i.e., the body (the biological foundation)" (p 125).

The authors trace the complex process of the establishment of the personality in their effort to develop a more or less streamlined normological theory. Unlike bourgeois sociology, which understands socialization to mean man's adaptation to existing social norms, customs, traditions and mores, the authors reemphasize the familiar Marxist concept to the effect that one of man's features is not only his adaptability to the environment but also his active transformation, through revolution if necessary.

The sociologization trend is manifested with increasing clarity in gerontology as well. Most of (3) deals with this phenomenon. The authors point out that as a result of its orientation toward social aspects, modern gerontology is increasingly integrating within a single entity its previously dispersed and unevenly developed parts. "By combining the various aspects of the study of the aging process," the authors believe, "social gerontology may assume a leading position in the structure of contemporary gerontology" (p 49).

The study of the axiological problems of gerontology reveals its specific synthesis of natural-science and sociohumanitarian knowledge and, in turn,

enriches our knowledge of man and increases the role of the natural sciences in resolving humanistic problems. The purpose of gerontology is not simply to prolong human life but, above all, to extend the creative period, man's active efforts. This leads to the appearance of yet another humanistic aspect of Marxist philosophy, which is also included in the solution of gerontological problems. The book proves the close tie between the basic gerontological concepts ("aging," "old age," "age") and philosophical categories ("time," "condition," "development," etc.). The authors have studied the various hypotheses (theories) of aging from the viewpoint of dialectical materialistic philosophy. They have made an interesting attempt to classify the gerontological disciplines.

One of the most important philosophical problems in medicine, which has drawn the great attention of medical philosophers and theoreticians in recent years (one could even speak of a certain increase in the interest shown in it compared with previous decades) has been the problem of causality. The relevance of this problem lies in its direct connection with the determination of still undiscovered reasons for diseases, the identification of pathogenic disease mechanisms and the increased effectiveness of prevention and treatment methods. "The shortcoming of many theories of causality in modern medicine," write the authors of (2), "is the fact that what is understood as their cause involves only separate elements (causal factors) which are assumed to be "the main reason" and which explain "the entire nature," "qualitative characteristics" and "essence" of the pathological process. According to them "the ability to single out among the variety of ties in the objective world (in each separate case) the basic genetic interaction together with the necessary and sufficient conditions for the development of a consequence is precisely the determination of the reasons for a given phenomenon" ((2), p 42; see also (9), pp 31-36). These works study the structure of causal interaction, define the foundations of specific interactions, trace the correlation between the external and internal processes in the development of a disease, try to classify the factors which trigger them, etc. Most of the works dealing with problems of causality in medicine criticize the mechanistic moncausality and idealistic conditionalism.

It is worth noting that in their discussion of philosophical problems in medicine the authors of all the works noted here have relied extensively on the history of science and philosophy. The intention of summing up existing experience in the development of such problems in the history of prewar Soviet science is particularly worthy of approval.

Studies of philosophical problems in medicine not only enrich theoretical medicine by contributing to the development of the Marxist philosophical apparatus on the basis of firm factual data from theoretical medicine (the categories of causality, time, structure, functions, etc.), but also prove the strengthened creative cooperation between philosophers and natural scientists.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003
CSO: 1802/13

SOVIET DIPLOMATIC DOCUMENTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 125-127

[Review by P. Sevost'yanov, doctor of historical sciences, of USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs document publications]

[Text] The study of foreign policy activities of the CPSU and Soviet state is an important component in the study of most recent history, the history of real socialism in particular. It helps us to understand the efficacy of Marxist-Leninist theory in international relations and the consistency between the foreign policy principles of the socialist state, formulated by V. I. Lenin, and the interest of supporting and strengthening peace and international security and ensuring progressive social development. What makes this even more important is the fact that bourgeois propaganda keeps trying to distort the nature and directions of Soviet foreign policy, to misrepresent it and, at the same time, to conceal its reactionary and aggressive imperialist course.

The publication of Soviet foreign policy documents -- the result of long years of work on the part of Soviet researchers -- justifiably holds an important position in the extensive effort to study the history of Soviet foreign policy and to interpret its experience. Such publications enjoy a well-deserved prestige because of their full and comprehensive coverage of the problems, high scientific standards, accuracy and objectivity. They are a great contribution to the dissemination of Lenin's foreign policy principles and the exposure of misrepresentations on the part of bourgeois politicians and historians. They constitute the documentary foundation without which the profound and comprehensive study of the international activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state would be inconceivable.

These publications are based on documents drawn from the files of the USSR MID [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] and Soviet and many other foreign departments and organizations mainly in the socialist countries.

The fundamental work "Dokumenty Vneshney Politiki SSSR" [Documents of USSR Foreign Policy] (Vol I-XXI, Moscow, 1957-1977), which covers the history of Soviet diplomacy during the period between the wars, enjoys a high reputation among the scientific public. These are records of outstanding accomplishments of Soviet foreign policy during the stages of the establishment of the Soviet system, the founding of the USSR and the active emergence of the young Soviet state in the international arena. The initial foreign policy acts of the

Soviet state and other documents included in these collections paint an impressive picture of the development of good neighborly relations between Soviet Russia and eastern countries, such as Iran, Afghanistan, Turkey, China, Mongolia and others. They show the collapse of the armed imperialist intervention against the young Soviet republic and the failure of the economic and financial blockades. History teaches us that even at that time "strong-arm methods" in the struggle against socialism proved to be totally bankrupt.

Documentary works of the USSR MID on a number of problems of the prewar period and the events during the initial stage of World War II, which objectively and thoroughly expose slanderous fabrications on the positions which the USSR held at that time, are of great value. A series of collections deals with the period covering the eve of the war, including some drafted jointly with institutions in a number of European socialist countries. Let us single out among them "SSSR v Bor'be za Mir Nakanune Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny (Sentyabr' 1938 g.- Avgust 1939 g.)" [The USSR in the Struggle for Peace on the Eve of World War II (September 1938-August 1939)] (Moscow, 1971), "Dokumenty po Istorii Myunkhenskogo Sgovora. 1937-1939 gg." [Documents on the History of the Munich Conspiracy, 1937-1939] (Moscow, 1971) and "Dokumenty i Materialy Kanuna Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny. 1937-1939 gg." [Documents and Materials Covering the Eve of World War II, 1937-1939] (vol 1-2, Moscow, 1981).

Such publications enable us to trace the development of international relations in prewar Europe and the confrontation among three strategies in world politics: The diplomacy of the aggressor, the diplomacy of the "pacifiers," and the diplomacy of the USSR, which was aimed at creating an effective collective security system and organizing the rebuff of the aggressor. The convincing language of facts in the USSR MID publications reveals the truth concerning the outbreak and nature of World War II and those who bear the responsibility for its outbreak.

The foreign policy activities of the Soviet Union during the Great Patriotic war is vividly depicted in a unique publication which contains the integral texts of the correspondence between J. V. Stalin, USSR Council of Ministers chairman, on the one hand, and U.S. Presidents Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman and British Prime Ministers Winston Churchill and Clement Attlee ("Perepiska Predsedatelya Soveta Ministrov SSSR s Prezidentami SShA i Prem'yer-Ministrami Velikobritanii vo Vremya Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny 1941-1945 gg." [Correspondence Between the USSR Council of Ministers Chairman and the U.S. Presidents and the Prime Ministers of Great Britain during the Great Patriotic War 1941-1945]. In two volumes, second edition. Moscow, 1976. Preface by A. A. Gromyko). This publication met with great interest on the part of scientists and the public. It is the most authoritative prime source for an objective study of international relations during the war.

The six-volume collection of documents "Sovetskiy Soyuz na Mezhdunarodnykh Konferentsiyakh Perioda Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny 1941-1945 gg." [The Soviet Union at International Conferences During the Period of the Great Patriotic War 1941-1945] (Moscow, 1978-1980, A. A. Gromyko, editor in chief), describes the manner in which the foundations of the postwar world were laid during the course of the fierce conflict with Hitlerite Germany. These publications contain extensive factual data which prove the persistent

and consistent efforts on the part of the Soviet state aimed at establishing a just and democratic peace and protecting the sovereignty and economic and political independence of a number of countries, such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Austria, Italy, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Finland, etc.

The collection of documents and materials "SSSR-Avstriya. 1938-1979 gg." [USSR-Austria, 1938-1978] (Moscow, 1980) was published on the occasion of the the 35th anniversary of the liberation of Austria from German fascism and the 25th anniversary of the signing of the state treaty on the restoration of a free and democratic Austria.

Problems of strengthening the friendship and development of cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries have held and always will hold a special priority position in Soviet international policy. Therefore, the work carried out jointly by the USSR MID and the ministries of foreign affairs of the socialist countries in the publication of documents on their bilateral and multilateral relations is of major political significance.

More than 30 collections of documents on the development of fraternal cooperation between the USSR and the members of the socialist comity since their establishments have already been published. In recent years, new joint publications have come out on relations between the USSR and Bulgaria, Vietnam, the GDR and Mongolia ("Sovetsko-Bolgarskiye Otnosheniya i Svyazi. 1917-1958 gg." [Soviet-Bulgarian Relations and Ties, 1917-1958]. Vol 1-2. Moscow, 1976, 1981; "Sovetskiy Soyuz-Vietnam. 30 Let Otnosheniya. 1950-1980" [Soviet Union-Vietnam. Thirty Years of Relations, 1950-1980]. Moscow, 1982; "SSSR-GDR. 30 Let Otnosheniya. 1949-1979 gg." [USSR-GDR. Thirty Years of Relations, 1949-1979]. Moscow, 1981; "Sovetsko-Mongol'skiye Otnosheniya. 1921-1974 gg." [Soviet-Mongolian Relations, 1921-1974]. Vol I-II. Moscow, 1975, 1979).

The second expanded edition of the collection of documents prepared through the joint efforts of the ministries of foreign affairs of the Warsaw Pact members ("Organizatsiya Varshavskogo Dogovora. 1955-1980 gg. Dokumenty i Materialy" [The Warsaw Pact, 1955-1980. Documents and Materials]. Moscow, 1980) came out in 1980, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Warsaw Pact.

Documentation of relations between the Soviet Union and the liberated countries is a topical problem in USSR MID publication work. Thus, a new edition on relations between the USSR and African countries ("SSSR i Strany Afriki. 1963-1970 gg." [The USSR and African Countries, 1963-1970] includes the most important documents which reflect the equal nature of our relations with the states on that continent and which are of unquestionable value to researchers.

A number of publications of foreign policy documents jointly drafted by Soviet specialists, scientific and diplomatic workers, historians and archivists in the capitalist countries came out in the 1970s. They include the collection of documents "Sovetsko-Frantsuzskiye Otnosheniya. 1965-1976 gg." [Soviet-French Relations, 1965-1976] (Moscow, 1976), a result of cooperation with the French Ministry of External Relations.

The bilateral collection of documents "Sovetsko-Meksikanskiye Otnosheniya. 1968-1980 gg." [Soviet-Mexican Relations, 1968-1980] (Moscow, 1981) came out in 1981. During his official trip to the USSR, Jose Castaneda, the then Mexican minister of foreign affairs described the work as a good foundation for writing a history of relations between the two countries.

The purposeful and consistent course of strengthening international peace and security followed by the CPSU and the Soviet state, and the desire of the USSR to restrain the arms race and for disarmament are reflected in the documents included in the book "Sovetskiy Soyuz v Bor'be za Razoruzheniye. Sbornik Dokumentov" [The Soviet Union in the Struggle for Disarmament. A Collection of Documents] (Moscow, 1977). The work includes agreements and treaties on disarmament in which the Soviet Union participated. It also includes the basic initiatives in this area, formulated by Soviet diplomacy in accordance with the resolutions of the 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses.

Pursuing their useful work, researchers and publishers are engaged in the preparation of new joint collections of documents on relations between the USSR and Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland and Czechoslovakia. Also being prepared are the collections "SSSR i Strany Afriki. 1970-1980 gg." [The USSR and African Countries, 1970-1980], "Sovetskiy Soyuz v Bor'be Protiv Kolonializma. 1960-1982 gg." [The Soviet Union in the Struggle Against Colonialism, 1960-1982] and the bilateral collection "Sovetsko-Finlynadskiye Otnosheniya. 1948-1983 gg." [Soviet-Finnish Relations, 1948-1983].

The publication of USSR MID documents convincingly confirms the invariable loyalty shown by the Soviet state to the cause of peace, democracy and social progress, its tireless struggle for a just settlement of international problems, desire to intensify fraternal relations with the members of the socialist comity, equal cooperation with the liberated countries and Soviet support for the principle of peaceful coexistence. These publications contain most important documents which cover many topical problems of the history and current condition of international relations, some of which insufficiently studied. They greatly contribute to the development of domestic and foreign historical science and play an important role in ideological and mass agitation work and foreign policy propaganda.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003
CSO: 1802/13

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 pp 127-128

[Text] 1. Marx, K. and Engels, F. "Izbrannyye Proizvedeniya" [Selected Works]. In 3 volumes. Vol I. Prepared for publication by N. U. Belousova and K. I. Konnova. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 635 pp.

2. Gorbachev, M. S. "Leninism -- Zhivoye Tvorcheskoye Ucheniye, Vernoye Rukovodstvo k Deystviyu" [Leninism -- a Living Creative Doctrine and True Manual for Action]. Speech at the celebration of the 113th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth on 22 April 1983, held in Moscow. A. P. Lushchikov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 30 pp.

3. Kapitonov, I. V. "Razvitiye Aktivnosti Trudyashchikhsya, Ukrepleniye Distsipliny, Sovershenstvovaniye Stilya Raboty -- Aktual'nyye Zadachi Pervichnykh Partiynykh Organizatsiy" [Developing the Activity of the Working People, Strengthening Discipline and Improving the Work Style -- Topical Tasks of the Primary Party Organizations]. Report delivered at the All-Union Practical Science Conference on 7 April 1983. N. A. Zolotarev in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 31 pages.

4. Bogat, Ye. M. "Ponimaniye" [Understanding]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 359 pp (Individual. Morality. Upbringing.).

5. Ignatov, V. N. "Distsiplina i Delovitost': Opyt, Problemy" [Discipline and Efficiency: Experience, Problems]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 64 pp (Party Worker Library; 2).

6. Makarenko, V. S. "Formy i Metody Partiynogo Rukovodstva Sel'skim Khozyaystvom" [Forms and Methods of Party Leadership of Agriculture]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 176 pp (Pocket Library of the Rural Party Organization Secretary).

7. Mel'nikov, Yu. M. "Sila i Bessiliye: Vneshnyaya Politika Washingtona" [Power and Debility: Washington's Foreign Policy], 1945-1982. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 368 pp.

8. "Militarizm" [Militarism]. Facts and figures. V. V. Borisov et al., authors. R. A. Faramazyan, general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 255 pp.

9. Neverov, I. M. "Sevastopol." Pages from the heroic defense and liberation of the city-hero 1941-1944. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 206 pp (Hero cities).

10. "Obostreniye Ideologicheskoy Bor'by na Mirovoy Arene i Politicheskoye Vospitanie Trudyashchikhsya" [The Aggravation of the Ideological Struggle in the World Arena and the Political Education of the Working People]. Based on materials of the All-Union Practical Science Conference in Tallinn (12-14 October 1982). Edited and compiled by M. V. Gramov and Yu. I. Kandalov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 128 pp (Experience and topical problems of the ideological struggle).

11. "Partiynoye Podpol'ye" [The Party Underground]. The activities of the clandestine party organs and organizations on occupied Soviet territory during the Great Patriotic War. N. N. Makarov, head of editorial collegium. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 352 pp.

12. Rudich, F. M. "Demokraticheskiy Kharakter Upravleniya Proizvodstvom pri Sotsializme" [The Democratic Nature of Production Management Under Socialism]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 191 pp.

13. Stepanova, Ye. A. "Karl Marx." Short biographic essay. Second edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 286 pp.

14. Surovtsev, Yu. I. "Neobkhodimist' Dialektiki" [The Necessity of Dialectics]. (On the methodology of the study of the international unity of Soviet literature.) Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Moscow, 1982, 535 pp.

15. Furov, V. G. "Burzhuaznyye Konstitutsii i Svoboda Sovesti" [Bourgeois Constitutions and Freedom of Conscience]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 95 pp (Atheist's Library).

16. Shteynberg, V. A. "Charlz Skott, Yego Druz'ya i Vragi" [Charles Scott, His Friends and Foes]. On Karl Janson. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 255 pp.

17. Erenfel'd B. K. "Tyazhelyy Front" [The Hard Front]. From the history of the bolshevik struggle against the tsarist secret police. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 142 pp.

18. Yakovlev, N. N. "Siluety Vashingtona" [Washington Silhouettes]. Political essays. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 414 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003
CSO: 1802/13

OBITUARY OF YURIY MIKHAYLOVICH LEBEDEV

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 83 p 128

[Text] Yuriy Mikhaylovich Lebedev, a noted international affairs journalist, deputy editor of this journal and RSFSR Honored Worker in Culture, passed away prematurely at the age of 55.

Inherent in Yu. M. Lebedev were party principle-mindedness, high idea-mindedness, exactingness toward himself, honesty and sincerity in relations with his comrades and a feeling of duty. Yuriy Mikhaylovich devoted all his strength, knowledge and experience wherever he worked -- at Sovinformburo, the Novosti Press Agency or as KOMMUNIST editor.

The KOMMUNIST collective attitude toward Yuriy Mikhaylovich was one of warmth, respect and friendly concern. We shall remember him forever.

The editors

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/13

END

**END OF
FICHE**

DATE FILMED

July 27, 1983